

APPENDIX C

QUALITY ASSURANCE PROJECT PLAN

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROJECT PLAN
PRE-REMEDIAL ACTION SAMPLING
COASTAL SALT MARSH
HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD
NOVATO, CALIFORNIA**

Final

Prepared by:



**US Army Corps
of Engineers ®**

Sacramento District
Environmental Design Section

June 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	Site Location and Project Objectives	1-1
1.2	QAPP Objectives and Use	1-2
2.0	PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES	2-1
2.1	Corps of Engineers.....	2-1
2.2	Project Management	2-1
2.2.1	Technical Team Leader.....	2-1
2.2.2	Project Chemist.....	2-2
2.2.3	Health and Safety Manager.....	2-2
2.2.4	Sampling Team Leader	2-2
2.2.5	Field Crew.....	2-2
3.0	QUALITY OBJECTIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DATA.....	3-1
3.1	Characteristics of Data Quality	3-1
3.2	Data Quality Objectives	3-2
4.0	SAMPLE ACQUISITION, CUSTODY, MANAGEMENT, AND DECONTAMINATION	4-1
5.0	ANALYTICAL METHODS AND CALIBRATION.....	5-1
5.1	Sample Preparation and Analytical Methods - Organic.....	5-3
5.1.1	Method SW3550B: Sonication Extraction.....	5-3
5.1.2	Method SW3630C: Silica Gel Cleanup	5-4
5.1.3	Method SW3640A: Gel-Permeation Cleanup	5-4
5.1.4	Method 3660B: Sulfur Cleanup	5-4
5.1.5	Method SW8081A/8082: Organochlorine Pesticides/Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs).....	5-4
5.1.6	Modified Method SW8270C: Phenol and Pentachlorophenol by GC/MS	5-5
5.1.7	Method SW8151A: Chlorinated Herbicide – Dichloroprop.....	5-5
5.1.8	Method SW8290: Dioxins by High Resolution GC/High Resolution MS	5-5
5.1.9	Method 1668A: Toxic Polychlorinated Biphenyls by Isotope Dilutions HRGC/HRMS	5-6
5.1.10	Method SW8015B Modified: Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons.....	5-6
5.2	Sample Preparation and Analysis Methods - Inorganic.....	5-7
5.2.1	Method SW3050B: Acid Digestion of Sediments, Sludges, and Soils.....	5-7
5.2.2	Method SW6010B: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectrometry	5-7
5.2.3	Method SW7471A: Cold Vapor Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy.....	5-8
5.2.4	Method SW4042: Total DDT in Soil Test Kits	5-8
6.0	QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL PROCEDURES.....	6-1
6.1	Calibration Procedures and Frequency	6-1
6.1.1	Gas Chromatography	6-1
6.1.2	GC/MS analysis	6-2
6.1.3	Inductively Coupled Argon Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectrometry (ICPES) Metals.....	6-3

6.1.4	Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy	6-3
6.2	Standard and Reagent Preparation	6-4
6.3	Field Quality Control Checks	6-5
6.4	Laboratory Quality Control Checks	6-5
6.4.1	Analytical Batch (Preparation Batch)	6-5
6.4.2	Blanks	6-6
6.4.3	Laboratory Control Samples	6-6
6.4.4	Matrix Spikes and Matrix Spike Duplicates	6-7
6.4.5	Surrogate Recoveries and Standard Additions	6-7
6.4.6	Calibration Standard	6-7
6.4.7	Reference Standard	6-8
6.4.8	Laboratory Performance Evaluation Samples	6-8
6.5	Corrective Action	6-8
6.6	Documentation	6-9
7.0	DATA REDUCTION, VALIDATION AND REPORTING	7-1
7.1	Laboratory	7-1
7.1.1	Data Reduction and Validation	7-1
7.1.2	Data Reporting	7-2
7.1.3	External Data Validation and Quality Assurance Reports	7-7
7.2	Field Activities	7-7
7.2.1	Data Reduction	7-7
7.2.2	Data Integrity	7-7
7.2.3	Data Validation	7-7
7.2.4	Data Storage	7-8
8.0	PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE	8-1
9.0	LABORATORY PROCEDURES USED TO ASSESS DATA QUALITY AND DETERMINE SENSITIVITY	9-1
9.1	Data Quality Assessment	9-1
9.1.1	Precision	9-1
9.1.2	Accuracy	9-2
9.1.3	Representativeness	9-3
9.1.4	Completeness	9-3
9.1.5	Comparability	9-4
9.2	Sensitivity	9-4
9.2.1	Method Detection Limit (MDL)	9-4
9.2.2	Quantitation Limit (QL)	9-4
10.0	CORRECTIVE ACTION FOR UNACCEPTABLE QUALITY CONTROL DATA	10-1
10.1	Field Activities	10-1
10.2	Laboratory	10-1
10.3	Non-routine Occurrence Reports	10-2
11.0	REFERENCES	11-1
11.1	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	11-1
11.2	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	11-1

11.3	Other Documents	11-1
------	-----------------------	------

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5-1. Summary of Analytical Methods.....	5-1
Table 5-2. Preservation and Holding Times	5-3
Table 8-1. Routine Laboratory Instrument Maintenance.....	8-1

ATTACHMENT A

Table A-1	Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW6010B (Metals)
Table A-2	Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW7471A (Mercury)
Table A-3	Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Modified Method SW8015B (TPH)
Table A-4	Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8081A (Organochlorine Pesticides)
Table A-5	Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8082 (PCBs)
Table A-6	Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8270C (SVOCs)
Table A-7	Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8290 (Dioxin/Furans)
Table A-8	Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method 1668A (PCB Homologues)
Table A-9	Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8151A (Chlorinated Herbicides)
Table A-10	Summary of Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW4042 (Total DDT in Soil Test Kit)

ATTACHMENT B

Table B-1	Quantitation Limits and Action Goals for Metals by Method SW6010B, Mercury by Method SW7471A
Table B-2	Quantitation Limits and Action Goals for Extractable Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons by Method SW8015B
Table B-3	Quantitation Limits and Action Goals for Organochlorine Pesticides by Method SW8081A

Table B-4	Quantitation Limits and Action Goals for Polychlorinated Biphenyls Compounds by Method SW8082
Table B-5	Quantitation Limits and Action Goals for Semi-volatile Organic Compounds by Method SW8270C
Table B-6	Quantitation Limits and Action Goals for Dioxins Congeners by Method SW8290
Table B-7	Quantitation Limits and Action Goals for PCB Homologues by Method 1668A
Table B-8	Quantitation Limits and Actions Goals for Chlorinated Herbicides by Method SW8151A

ATTACHMENT C

Table C-1	Data Qualifier Convention for Inorganic Analyses
Table C-2	Data Qualifier Convention for GC Analyses
Table C-3	Data Qualifier Convention for GC/MS Analyses

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADR	Automated Data Review
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
CCB	Continuing Calibration Blank
CCC	Calibration Check Compounds
CCV	Continuing Calibration Verification
CDQAR	Chemical Data Quality Assessment Report
CESPK	Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District
CL	Control Limit
COC	Chain of Custody
CSM	Coastal Salt Marsh
CVAA	Cold Vapor Atomic Absorption
DL	Detection Limit
DoD	Department of Defense
DQO	Data Quality Objectives
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
ECD	Electron Capture Detector
EDD	Electronic Data Deliverable
ELCD	Electrolytic Conductivity Detector
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FSP	Field Sampling Plan
GC	Gas Chromatograph
HAAF	Hamilton Army Airfield

ICAL	Initial Calibration
ICB	Initial Calibration Blank
ICP	Inductively Coupled Plasma (Spectroscopy)
ICS	Interference Check Standard
ICV	Initial Calibration Verification
IS	Internal Standard
LCS	Laboratory Control Sample
LIMS	Laboratory Information Management System
MDL	Method Detection Limit
MS	Matrix Spike
MSA	Method of Standard Addition
MSD	Matrix Spike Duplicate
µg/kg	micrograms per kilogram
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram
ng/kg	nanograms per kilogram
NELAC	National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference
PARCC	Precision, Accuracy, Representativeness, Comparability, and Completeness
P.E.	Professional Engineer
PM	Project Manager
QL	Quantitation Limit
QA	Quality Assurance
QAC	Quality Assurance Chemist
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
QC	Quality Control
RF	Response Factor
RPD	Relative Percent Difference
ROD/RAP	Record of Decision/Remedial Action Plan
RRF	Relative Response Factor
RSD	Relative Standard Deviation
RT	Retention Time
SD	Serial Dilution

SIM	Selective Ion Monitoring
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SPCC	System Performance Check Compounds
Total DDTs	Sum of DDD, DDE, and DDT concentrations
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
WP	Work Plan

QUALITY ASSURANCE PROJECT PLAN PRE-REMEDIAL ACTION SAMPLING COASTAL SALT MARSH HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) presents functions, procedures, and specific quality assurance (QA) and quality control (QC) activities designed to achieve the data quality goals for the various objectives of the sampling efforts at nine in-board sites described in the Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) at Hamilton Army Airfield Coastal Salt Marsh. This project is conducted by the Environmental Design Section of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District (CESPK) under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) for the Army Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) environmental office. This QAPP is prepared in accordance with guidelines set forth in the following documents:

- EPA QA/R-5, EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans (U.S. EPA, 2001).
- USACE ER-1110-1-263, Chemical Data Quality Management for Hazardous Wastes Remedial Activities, (Department of Army, 1998)
- Department of Navy, Quality Systems Manual for Environmental Laboratories, Department of Defense, 2002)

This document accompanies the Work Plan (WP), DQOs, and the Field Sampling Plan (FSP).

1.1 Site Location and Project Objectives

The proposed excavation sites locations are illustrated in Figure 1-2 of the Work Plan. The objectives for the following excavation sites included in this sampling effort are summarized below. To achieve the objectives, samples will be collected from the following sampling locations and depths based upon the results of any previous sampling and analyzed for contaminants previously identified for the area. The results will be compared to selected criteria values developed for Hamilton Army Airfield sites.

Boat Dock Under the Dock – Verify lateral and vertical extent of contamination
Boat Dock In the Channel – Verify lateral and vertical extent of contamination
Area 14 Motor Oil – Verify lateral and vertical extent of contamination

Area 14 Cobalt – Confirm cobalt exceedence and lateral extent
Historic Outfall Drainage Ditch (ODD) Northern Half of Excavation – Verify lateral and vertical extent of contamination
Historic ODD Southern Half of Excavation – Verify lateral and vertical extent of contamination
East Levee Construction Debris Disposal Area (ELCDDA) – Confirm PCB contamination
ELCDDA Lead and Zinc - Verify lateral and vertical extent of contamination
ELCDDA Burn Pit- Verify lateral and vertical extent of contamination
Outfall Drainage Ditch – Verify lateral and vertical extent of contamination
ODD Building 39 Outfall - Verify lateral and vertical extent of contamination
Former Sewage Treatment Plant (FSTP) Outfall Area - Verify lateral extent of contamination and determine possible expansion of excavation
FSTP Channel – Verify lateral and vertical extent of contamination and determine length of excavation
High Marsh Plain Boundary Excavation – Verify lateral extent of contamination
High Marsh Plain Inside Boundary Excavation – Define vertical extent of contamination
High Marsh Plain Eastern Extension of ODD – Verify lateral extent of ODD contamination in high marsh
Western Extension of Proposed Excavation – Verify lateral extent of ODD contamination towards levee
Marsh Plain DDT Assay - survey of surface DDT
Antenna Debris Disposal Area East – Define lateral and vertical extent of contamination
Antenna Debris Disposal Area West – Define lateral and vertical extent of contamination

1.2 QAPP Objectives and Use

Standard procedures and specifications are established to ensure that all laboratories produce comparable data, and that data quality is consistently assessed and documented. The specific objectives of this QAPP are to:

- provide standardized references and quality specifications for all anticipated field sampling, analysis, and data review procedures required for the project sites;
- provide guidance and criteria for selected field and analytical procedures; and
- establish procedures for reviewing and documenting compliance with field and analytical procedures.

The fieldwork will include removal of soil in area of proposed excavation, soil sample collection, packaging, and shipping to offsite laboratory for analysis.

2.0 PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1 Corps of Engineers

The following Sacramento District, Corps of Engineers personnel have been assigned to accomplish the sampling design and execution required supporting this project. The USACE Project Manager is Ray Zimny. The project execution will be performed under the general supervision of Rick Meagher P.E., Chief of Environmental Design Section. The technical team consists of the following personnel:

Project Chemist/Technical Team Leader: Kathy Siebenmann (916) 557-7180

Geologist/Sampling Team Leader: Tim Crummett (916) 557-6942

Health & Safety Manager: Donna Maxey (916) 557-7437

USACE fax number: (916) 557-7465

2.2 Project Management

The Project Manager (PM) will be responsible for the effective conduct of all work. The PM will be the primary contact for regulatory agencies, senior management and the technical team for the USACE. The PM will be responsible for oversight and approval of project performance, planning, financial management, scheduling, quality of work and compliance with all project criteria. The PM will also review reports and any resulting corrective action disposition.

2.2.1 Technical Team Leader

The Technical Team Leader will be responsible for reviewing the sampling plans and associated field activities, and ensuring that all sampling activities conform to the QAPP. The Project Leader will oversee quality assurance of field activities. Prior to the start of field activities, preparatory meetings will be held with the field crew. If field conditions require modifications to protocol outlined in the SAP or if questions arise, the Sampling Team Leader or field crew will contact the Technical Team Leader for direction. The Technical Team Leader will also be responsible for overseeing the project and subcontractors, directing field crews, and the compilation of data. The Technical Team Leader reports to the Section Chief.

2.2.2 Project Chemist

The Project Chemist will have a “hands on” role in management of project tasks associated with sampling and analysis. These tasks include:

- Coordination with the analytical laboratory to ensure readiness to implement project specific requirements,
- Review of analytical data as it becomes available to ensure conformance with quality standards, and
- Implementation of corrective actions in accordance with QAPP specifications when review of data uncovers deficiencies.

2.2.3 Health and Safety Manager

The certified industrial hygienist is responsible for the general health and safety plan development and training for field personnel. This individual is also responsible for ensuring that health and safety procedures are understood and followed by all field personnel, and for reporting and correcting any violations of policy or regulations.

2.2.4 Sampling Team Leader

The Sampling Team Leader will be responsible for quality assurance of field activities and for executing all work elements related to the sampling program, including documenting field activities, maintaining field notes and photographs, maintaining a record of onsite personnel and visitors, and implementing the sampling plan. These tasks include instruction of field personnel in sampling and preservation requirements and general oversight of field personnel involved in sampling activities.

2.2.5 Field Crew

Field crew personnel will be responsible for performance of project mobilization, demobilization, sample collection and oversight. Field personnel will report to the Sampling Team Leader. Field personnel will include members of the USACE Environmental Engineering Branch, Sacramento District.

3.0 QUALITY OBJECTIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

3.1 Characteristics of Data Quality

The term “data quality” refers to the level of uncertainty associated with a particular data set. Data quality associated with environmental measurement is a function of the sampling plan rationale and procedures used to collect the samples, as well as of the analytical methods and instrumentation used in making the measurements. Uncertainty cannot be entirely eliminated from environmental data. However, quality assurance programs effective in measuring uncertainty in data are employed to monitor and control excursions from the desired data quality objectives (DQOs). The DQO process and data needs are specified in Attachment A. Sources of uncertainty that can be traced to the sampling component are poor sampling plan design, incorrect sample handling, faulty sample transportation, and inconsistent use of standard operating procedures. The most common sources of uncertainty that can be traced to the analytical component of the total measurement system are calibration and contamination.

The purpose of this QAPP is to ensure that the data collected are of known and documented quality and useful for the purposes for which they are intended. The procedures described are designed to obtain data quality indicators for each field procedure and analytical method. Data quality indicators include the PARCC parameters (i.e., Precision, Accuracy, Representativeness, Comparability, and Completeness). To ensure that quality data continues to be produced, systematic checks must show that test results and field procedures remain reproducible and that the analytical methodology is actually measuring the quantity of analytes in each sample.

A laboratory certified by the State of California and validated by the USACE or successfully audited by National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference (NELAC) auditors will generate all laboratory chemical data. Laboratories must have an in-place program for data reduction, validation, and reporting as discussed in Section 7.0. The reliability and credibility of analytical laboratory results can be corroborated by the inclusion of a program of scheduled replicate analyses, analyses of standard or spiked samples, and analysis of split samples with QA laboratories for some projects. Regularly scheduled analyses of known duplicates, standards, and spiked samples are a routine aspect of data reduction, validation, and reporting procedures.

All data that will be collected for this project will be definitive data using EPA procedures and will be usable in identification, characterization, and engineering design. The data obtained will conform to the quality control requirements specified in the following text and the tables accompanying this document.

3.2 Data Quality Objectives

To generate data that will meet the project objectives, it is necessary to define the types of decisions that will be made, identify the intended use of the data, and design a data collection program. Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) are defined as an integrated set of thought processes, which define data quality requirements based on the intended use of the data. Data Quality Objectives are necessary in obtaining sufficient data of known defensible quality for the intended use. The DQO process will assist in determining the appropriate sampling design, detection and quantitation limits, analytical methods, and sample handling procedures.

Step 1: State the Problem

The Army is responsible for removing contaminated soil, at unacceptable levels, due to historical operations at Hamilton Army Airfield. Nine sites within the Coastal Salt Marsh have been identified as areas containing soil contaminants above acceptable levels.

Step 2: Identify the Decision

The decision is to determine the dimensions at each site that will be excavated within each area of contamination in the Coastal Salt Marsh.

Step 3: Identify the Inputs to the Decision

The analytical results will be compared to selected action goal values developed for the Hamilton Army Airfield sites. These values are listed in Section 1.4 of the attached Work Plan. In addition, the following information will be used to determine the most effective sampling strategy.

Area(s) of Concern	Information Required	Location of Information	SI Activity to Provide Information
Boat Dock: Under the Dock and In the Channel	Historical data Vertical and lateral extent of contamination	USACE Sampling Data Report, FW Remedial Design Report, CSM Focused Feasibility Study (FFS) and ROD/RAP To be collected as part of this sampling effort	Previous Sampling Investigations Soil sample collection and analysis for metals and pesticides
Area 14	Historical data Vertical and lateral extent of contamination	USACE Sampling Data Report, FFS and ROD/RAP To be collected as part of this sampling effort	Previous Sampling Investigations Soil sample collection and analysis for extractable total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH-E) and metals
Historical Outfall Drainage Ditch (ODD) – northern half of excavation	Historical data Vertical and lateral extent of contamination	USACE Sampling Data Report, Woodward-Clyde Environmental Investigation, FFS and ROD/RAP To be collected during this sampling effort	Previous Sampling Investigations Soil sample collection and analysis for metals and pesticide dichlorprop
Historic ODD – southern half of excavation	Historical data Vertical and lateral extent of contamination	USACE Sampling Data Report, FFS and ROD/RAP To be collected during this sampling effort	Previous Sampling Investigations Soil sample collection and analysis total DDTs
East Levee Construction Debris Disposal Area (ELCDDA) – PCBs	Historical data Confirmation of PCB contamination	USACE Sampling Data Report, FFS and ROD/RAP To be collected during this sampling effort	Previous Sampling Investigations Soil sample collection and analysis for PCBs and homologues.
ELCDDA – lead and zinc	Historical data Vertical and lateral extent of contamination	USACE Sampling Data Report, FFS and ROD/RAP To be collected during this sampling effort	Previous Sampling Investigations Soil sample collection and analysis for metals
ELCDDA – Burn Pit	Historical data	USACE Sampling Data Report, IT Remedial Investigation Report, FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations

Area(s) of Concern	Information Required	Location of Information	SI Activity to Provide Information
	Vertical and lateral extent of contamination	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection and analysis for PCB homologues, TPH-E, and dioxin congeners
ODD	Historical data	FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations
	Vertical and lateral extent of contamination	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection and analysis for metals, TPH-E, PCBs, SVOCs and pesticides
ODD – Bldg 39 outfall	Historical data	FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations
	Vertical and lateral extent of contamination	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection and analysis for metals, TPH-E PCBs, SVOCs and pesticides
Former Sewage Treatment Plant (FSTP) Outfall Area	Historical data	USACE Sampling Data Report, FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations
	Lateral extent of contamination	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection and analysis for metals and PCBs
FSTP – Channel	Historical data	USACE Sampling Data Report, FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations
	Lateral and vertical extent of contamination	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection and analysis for metals, pesticides and PCBs
High Marsh Plain	Historical data	FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations
	Lateral extent of contamination	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection and analysis for metals and PCBs
High Marsh Plain – eastern extension of ODD	Historical data	FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations
	Lateral extent of ODD contamination into the high marsh	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection and analysis for metals, TPH-E PCBs, SVOCs and pesticides
High Marsh Plain –	Historical data	FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations

Area(s) of Concern	Information Required	Location of Information	SI Activity to Provide Information
Plain – western extension of proposed excavation	Lateral extent of ODD contamination towards levee nearest the pump station outfall	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection and analysis for metals, TPH-E PCBs, SVOCs and pesticides
High Marsh Plain	Historical data	FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations
	Vertical extent of contamination	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection and analysis for metals and PCBs
Marsh Plain DDT Assay	Lateral survey of surface DDT concentrations	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection and kit analysis for total DDT
Antenna Debris Disposal Area – East	Historical data	FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations
	Lateral and vertical extent of contamination	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection (includes step outs) and analysis for TPH-E (diesel and motor oil), pesticides and PCBs
Antenna Debris Disposal Area - West	Historical data	FFS and ROD/RAP	Previous Sampling Investigations
	Lateral extent of contamination	To be collected during this sampling effort	Soil sample collection (includes step outs) and analysis for TPH-E (diesel and motor oil), pesticides and PCBs

Step 4: Define the Boundaries

Spatial Boundaries: The areas to be sampled have been physically identified based upon previous data and historical photographs.

Time Boundaries: The project should be performed between December 2003 and February 2004 due to the mating and nesting habits of endangered species that may be present in the Coastal Salt Marsh. All field sampling events are scheduled for January 2004 through February 2004. The field sampling may occur in more than one phase of sampling.

Sampling must be scheduled to coincide with the low tide to minimize the water in the ODD and any that may cover portions of the Coastal Salt Marsh.

Step 5: Develop a Decision Rule

The following decision rules apply to all areas of the Coastal Salt Marsh.

- If any individual analytical results are equal to or greater than the action goal values from the Hamilton AAF ROD/RAP 2003, then a step-out sampling strategy will be assessed for the site to further define the boundaries of the excavation vertically and horizontally. However, this type of sampling methodology will not be performed under this work effort until all sampling data from a site have been evaluated.
- If all individual analytical results are less than the action goals values, enough information will be available to determine if the limits of the excavation have been defined or if step-in sampling methodology will be performed because there is not enough historical data available to determine the limits of the excavation.

Step 6: Specify Tolerable Limits on Decision Errors

The decision errors inherent in selecting sampling locations and analyzing chemicals in soil and sediment consist of potential errors in sample design, location, heterogeneity, and sample analysis.

- Many of the sampling locations were selected using a judgmental sampling strategy based upon historical data. For all sampling locations, the assumption is that the sampling locations and numbers of samples will be representative of the immediate area at each investigation area. The number of samples is selected to minimize any decision errors; however, a high degree of heterogeneity would increase the probability of decision errors. Heterogeneity may be assessed by comparing the field duplicate sample results and will be considered in data interpretation. The use of site-specific visual, spatial, and analytical information should reduce the probability of sample design and location errors.
- The acceptable range of decision errors as a consequence of analytical errors will be evaluated during the data review, evaluation and validation process. Data found outside of acceptance criteria during validation will be qualified as estimated or rejected, as appropriate. The nature of the deficiency and the proximity to the associated action level will be used to assess the usability of the data. Adherence to quality control protocols in this QAPP should reduce the probability of analytical errors.

Step 7: Optimize the Sampling Design

Both judgmental (authoritative) and systematic sampling strategies apply to these areas within the Coastal Salt Marsh, based upon EPA guidance (EPA 2000a). Judgmental sampling was used when previous data was available and the horizontal and/or vertical boundary of the area to be excavated was not adequately defined. The initial sampling point and the spacing for the systematic sampling strategy was selected based upon the historical use of the site, visual observation, and characteristics of similar sites where the extent has previously been defined.

4.0 SAMPLE ACQUISITION, CUSTODY, MANAGEMENT, AND DECONTAMINATION

Sample acquisition, custody, management, and decontamination procedures are described in the Field Sampling Plan (FSP).

The samples will be sent to a State of California and USACE certified or NELAC audited laboratory. The USACE certification includes in-depth audits to determine if quality assurance and quality control measures are in place and adequate. These audits are based upon many of the same elements as the NELAC audits:

- Sample custody procedures
- Calibration procedures and documentation
- Completeness of data forms, notebooks and other reporting requirements
- Data review and validation procedures
- Data storage, filing and record keeping procedures
- QC procedures, tolerances and documentation
- Operating conditions of facilities and equipment
- Documentation of training and maintenance activities, systems and operations overview
- Security of laboratory automated systems.

The address and point of contact will be listed here after selection of the laboratory.

Point of Contact: Jim Carter
Emax Laboratories, Inc.
1835 West 205th Street
Torrance, California 90501
Telephone: (310) 618-8889
Fax: (310) 618-0818
Email: jcarter@emaxlabs.com

5.0 ANALYTICAL METHODS AND CALIBRATION

This section contains brief descriptions of preparation and analytical methods that will be used to analyze soil samples collected for this project. These methods are listed in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1. Summary of Analytical Methods

Analytes	Preparatory	Analytical Methods
Metals (arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, cadmium, chromium, cobalt, copper, lead, manganese, nickel, silver, vanadium and zinc)	SW3050B	SW6010B
Mercury	As per the Method	SW7471A
Dichloroprop	SW3550B	SW8151A
Total DDTs (summation of DDT, DDE, DDD), heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, total chlordanes (summation of alpha chlordane and gamma chlordane), endrin aldehyde	SW3550B, SW3630C	SW8081A
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons Extractables (TPH-E) (diesel, motor oil)	SW3550B, SW3630C	SW8015B mod.
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)	SW3550B, SW3630C	SW8082
PCB Homologues	As per the Method	Method 1668A
Phenol, Pentachlorophenol	SW3550B, SW3630C	SW8270C
Dioxins	SW3550B	SW8290
Total DDT in Soil Test Kit	As per the Method	SW4042

If during the course of a project, it becomes necessary to apply a different quantitation limit

because of changes in instrument capabilities, the Project Chemist will be notified and approval must first be obtained in instances where higher quantitation limits result. Methodology references contain specific QC criteria associated with the particular methods. These specific requirements include calibration and QC samples, and are described in detail within the methods. Daily performance tests and demonstrations of precision and accuracy are required. These calibration and QC samples are listed in Attachment A to this QAPP.

The laboratory methods identified in this document were published by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) in *Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods SW-846*, Third Edition (November 1986; Revision 1, July 1992; and Revision 2, November 1992, Update I, August 1993, Update II, September 1994, Update III, 1998). Preservation and holding times for these analytical procedures are presented in Table 5-2. Attachment A summarizes the calibration and the internal quality control procedures; Attachment B lists the quantitation limits and action goals that will be used for this project.

Table 5-2. Preservation and Holding Times

Method	Chemical Preservation	Holding Time	Temperature Preservation
SW8151A	None	14 days before extraction, 40 days after extraction	Cool to 4°C
SW8081A	None	14 days before extraction, 40 days after extraction	Cool to 4°C
SW 8015B mod.	None	14 days before extraction, 40 days after extraction	Cool to 4°C
Method 1668A	None	14 days before extraction, 40 days after extraction	Cool to 4°C
SW8082	None	14 days before extraction, 40 days after extraction	Cool to 4°C
Modified SW8270C	None	14 days before extraction, 40 days after extraction	Cool to 4°C
SW8290	None	14 days before extraction, 40 days after extraction	Cool to 4°C
SW6010B	None	40 days before digestion, 6 months after digestion	None
SW7471A	None	28 days to analysis	Cool to 4°C

5.1 Sample Preparation and Analytical Methods - Organic

The following sections briefly summarize the sample preparation and analytical methods to be performed for the determination of organic analytes.

Elemental sulfur is encountered in many sediments, industrial effluents, and sample containing biological material such as algae. Sulfur, if not removed, presents an interference in many organic analysis procedures, especially pesticide analysis using an electron capture detector. All samples submitted for organic analysis will undergo a various cleanup method, depending upon the interferences encountered following extraction. Not all potential cleanup methods are included below. The Project Chemist should be advised of any alternative cleanup methods proposed by the laboratory.

5.1.1 Method SW3550B: Sonication Extraction

Method 3550B is a procedure for extracting nonvolatile and semivolatile organic compounds from solids such as soils, wastes, and sludges. The sonication process ensures intimate contact of the sample matrix with the extraction solvent. A weighted portion of the solid

material is mixed with the anhydrous sodium sulfate, ground to form a free-flowing powder, and then dispersed into the methylene chloride. The extract is separated from the sample by vacuum or gravity filtration, or centrifugation, and then dried with anhydrous sodium sulfate and concentrated to an appropriate volume for analysis.

5.1.2 Method SW3630C: Silica Gel Cleanup

Generally, solid-phase extraction cartridges filled with silica gel are used. Aliquots of sample extract are loaded onto the cartridges that are then eluted with suitable solvents, depending upon the analysis method. The collected fractions are analyzed by the appropriate method.

5.1.3 Method SW3640A: Gel-Permeation Cleanup

The extract is passed through a column containing a hydrophobic gel absorbent. The column is then flushed with clean organic solvents to separate the interferences from the analytes of interest by retention time.

5.1.4 Method 3660B: Sulfur Cleanup

The extract is shaken with either copper or tetrabutylammonium sulfite to remove interfering sulfur from the extract. The mixture is allowed to settle and the eluent is removed for analysis.

5.1.5 Method SW8081A/8082: Organochlorine Pesticides/Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

Method 8081A/8082 is used to determine the concentration of various organochlorine pesticides and PCBs as aroclors. For this project the methods will be used to determine the concentration of DDD, DDE, DDT (total DDT), total chlordane (alpha and gamma chlordane), heptaclor, heptaclor epoxide, endrin aldehyde and aroclors on a gas chromatograph (GC). Prior to analysis, the sample is extracted into solution. An aliquot of solution is injected into an open-tubular capillary column, and detected by an electron capture detector (ECD) or electrolytic conductivity detector (ELCD). Any compounds identified tentatively in the primary analysis are confirmed on a second GC column.

5.1.6 Modified Method SW8270C: Phenol and Pentachlorophenol by GC/MS

Method SW8270C is used to quantify most neutral, acidic, and basic organic compounds that are soluble in methylene chloride. For this project the method will be used to determine the concentrations of phenol and pentachlorophenol (PCP). The concentrated extract is injected into a gas chromatograph for separation and detected by mass spectrometry. Mass spectrometry provides a characteristic ion pattern for fragmented target analytes, providing a high level of confidence in compound identification. Compounds are quantitated by comparing the response of a characteristic ion to the average response from a 5-point calibration. The internal standard technique is used for calibration.

5.1.7 Method SW8151A: Chlorinated Herbicide – Dichloroprop

Method SW8151A is used to determine chlorinated phenoxy acid herbicides compounds. For this project the method will be used to determine the concentration of dichloroprop. The concentrated extract is injected into a GC with a wide-bore fused-silica capillary column. The GC is temperature programmed to separate the analytes within the capillary column. The compounds are then detected by the ECD.

Qualitative identification is achieved by detecting a peak within a known retention time window of a target compound on two dissimilarly phased capillary columns. Sample quantitation is achieved by comparing the area response of a peak to the area response from a five-point calibration curve.

5.1.8 Method SW8290: Dioxins by High Resolution GC/High Resolution MS

This method is appropriate for the determination of tetra-, penta-, hexa-, hepta-, and octa-chlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDDs) and furans (PCDFs) in soil and sediment. Method SW8290 uses matrix-specific extraction, analyte-specific cleanup, and high-resolution capillary column gas chromatography/high resolution mass spectrometry (HRGS/HRMS) techniques. The sensitivity of the method is dependent upon the level of interference within a given matrix. The analysis includes a technique for calculating the detection limit for each of the chlorination levels and each congener by using the noise level present in the elution window and the height of the chromatographic peak of the internal standard. Method SW8290 requires 10 isotopically labeled analogs of target analytes to be spiked into each sample before extraction to assess matrix effects on method performance. Target analytes are quantitated relative to the isotope analog; therefore, their calculated concentration is compensated for extraction efficiency.

5.1.9 Method 1668A: Toxic Polychlorinated Biphenyls by Isotope Dilutions HRGC/HRMS

Method 1668A is used to determine coplanar PCBs, mono- through ortho-substituted PCB congeners, and ten PCB homologues in water, soil, sediment, and other sample matrices. Method 1668A is a performance-based method; variances from the exact procedure in the method are allowed as long as the specifications for quality are met. This method uses a GC/HRMS/Selective Ion Monitoring (SIM). The method is based upon the combined features of SW8082 to measure PCB homologues and Method 1668A to extract, cleanup, sample extracts, and measure toxic PCB congener target compounds.

5.1.10 Method SW8015B Modified: Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons

Method SW8015B modified is used to determine the total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) quantitated as gasoline and diesel as described by the California DHS LUFT Manual (October 1989).

Extractable TPH component, diesel is first extracted via Method 3510 (separatory funnel) for water-based matrices. Methylene chloride is used as the extracting solvent. Typically, one liter of water is extracted and concentrated in volume. Analysis is accomplished on a GC equipped with a capillary or megabore column and FID detector. For this project diesel #2 and motor oil are contaminants of concern.

Identification and quantitation of TPH components (both 8015B mod. methods) is based on pattern recognition techniques and requires a greater degree of analytical judgment than other GC methods. The TPH chromatograms consist of groups of peaks that have a general shape or pattern and fall within a noted carbon range (i.e., number of carbon atoms in the molecule). Gasoline and diesel fuel will be used to calibrate the instruments and determine response factors for quantitation of sample results. No second-column confirmation will be performed because identification is based on pattern recognition and not retention time (where false positives due to interference are likely). In addition, motor oil will be analyzed as identification standard for chromatographic pattern recognition, i.e., the resulting patterns and carbon ranges will be used to compare to sample chromatograms for identification. The sample results will be reported as gasoline, diesel fuel, or motor oil according to the closest matching carbon range. The concentrations are determined by quantitating the sample against either gasoline (Method 8015B-purgeable) or diesel (Method 8015B-extractable). Often, unknown or un-calibrated

hydrocarbons are encountered; therefore, the concentration reported is considered estimated. Carbon ranges and significant deviations of the pattern from the patterns of reported analytes will be described in the analytical report.

<u>Analyte</u>	<u>Carbon Range for Quantitation</u>
Diesel range organics	C12 - C24
Motor Oil	C24 - C36

Quantitation of both standards and samples will be performed by adding the area from all peaks from the baseline to the height of the peaks. In cases where the range of the pattern in the sample extends outside of the gasoline, diesel fuel, or lubricating oil standard ranges, the area throughout the range of the sample pattern should be quantitated (relative to gasoline or diesel) and reported as the analyte (gasoline, diesel, motor oil etc.) closest in carbon range to the sample pattern. The GC will be calibrated via the external standard technique. The average response factor is used for quantitation.

5.2 Sample Preparation and Analysis Methods - Inorganic

The following sections briefly summarize the sample preparation and analysis methods to be performed for the determination of inorganic analytes.

5.2.1. Method SW3050B: Acid Digestion of Sediments, Sludges, and Soils

This digestion procedure is used for the preparation of solid samples for analysis by inductively coupled plasma/atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP). A mixture of nitric acid, and the material to be analyzed is refluxed in a covered Griffin beaker or equivalent. This step is repeated with additional portions of nitric acid until the digestate is light in color or until its color has stabilized. Hydrogen peroxide is then added and the mixture warmed. The digestate is then cooled and brought to a low volume with water. If the digestate contains suspended solids, it must be centrifuged, filtered, or allowed to settle before analysis.

5.2.2 Method SW6010B: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectrometry

ICP determines elements in solution. The sample requires digestion by Method SW3050B for soil prior to analysis.

The method provides a simultaneous or sequential multi-element determination of elements by ICP. Element-emitted light is measured by optical spectrometry. Samples are nebulized and

the resulting aerosol is transported to the plasma torch. Element-specific atomic line emission spectra are produced by radio frequency inductively coupled plasma. The spectra are dispersed and photo-multiplier tubes monitor the intensities of the lines. The spectra are the physical property of the element and the intensity is proportional to the concentration of the element in solution.

5.2.3 Method SW7471A: Cold Vapor Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy

Method SW7471A is based on the absorption of radiation at the 253.7 nm wavelength by mercury vapor. The mercury is reduced to the elemental state and aerated from solution in a closed system. The mercury vapor passes through a cell positioned in the light path of an atomic absorption spectrophotometer. Absorbance is measured as a function of mercury concentration. Quantitation is accomplished by comparing the absorbance to a five-point calibration curve prepared from standards of known mercury concentration.

5.2.4 Method SW4042: Total DDT in Soil Test Kits

Method SW4042 is based on the use of polyclonal antibodies that bind either DDT or DDT-Enzyme Conjugate. These antibodies are immobilized to the walls of the test tubes. When DDT is present in the sample, it competes with DDT-Enzyme Conjugate for a limited number of antibody binding sites. Since there are the same numbers of antibody binding sites on every test tube and each test tube receives the same number of DDT-Enzyme Conjugate molecules, a sample that contains a low concentration of DDT allows the antibody to bind many DDT-Enzyme Conjugate molecules. Therefore, a low concentration of DDT produces a dark blue solution. Conversely, a high concentration of DDT allows fewer DDT-Enzyme Conjugate molecules to be bound by the antibodies, resulting in a lighter blue solution.

6.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL PROCEDURES

6.1 Calibration Procedures and Frequency

All instruments and equipment used during sample analysis are operated, calibrated, and maintained according to the manufacturer's guidelines and recommendations, as well as criteria set forth in the applicable analytical methods. Personnel properly trained in these procedures will operate, calibrate, and maintain the instruments. Laboratory capabilities will be demonstrated initially for instrument and reagent/standards performance as well as accuracy and precision of analytical methodology.

Calibration of instruments is required to ensure that the analytical system is operating correctly and functioning at the proper sensitivity to meet established quantitation limits. Each instrument will be calibrated with standard solutions appropriate to the type of instrument and the linear range established for the analytical method presented in Section 5.0. The frequency of calibration and calibration verification and the concentration of calibration standards are determined by the manufacturer's guidelines and the analytical method. Calibration procedures for all instruments are summarized in the method-specific tables in Attachment A. All samples must be bracketed by passing calibration check samples for the majority of methods. Failure to bracket all samples with acceptable calibration checks may result in the reanalysis of affected samples.

6.1.1 Gas Chromatography

The field of chromatography involves a variety of instrumentation and detection systems. While calibration standards and acceptance criteria vary depending on the type of system and analytical methodology required for a specific analysis, the general principles of calibration apply uniformly. As outlined in EPA SW-846 procedures, each chromatographic system is calibrated prior to performance of analyses using five concentrations by external standard technique for all columns. The lowest calibration standard shall be within a factor of two relative to the QL, and the others corresponding to the expected range of concentrations or defining the working range of the detector. This is done on each chromatographic column and each instrument at the beginning of the contract period and each time a new column is installed. The results are used to determine a calibration curve and response factors for each analyte. Initial calibration consists of determining the working range, establishing limits of detection, and establishing retention time windows. The calibration is checked on a daily basis to ensure that

the system remains within specifications. Second column confirmation is required for single compound analytes.

Continuing calibration standards are analyzed to check the instrument response relative to the initial calibration curve at the beginning and end of each analytical run. Calibration checks are also performed for overall system performance and for retention time shifts, as specified in SW-846. Individual and standard mixes are analyzed to establish response factors and absolute retention time. The response factors and retention times are verified throughout the analytical run and at the end of the analytical sequence. Each analyte must be within its retention time window or the analyst shall take corrective action. For GC analyses conducted on this project, the response factor must agree with the factor determined during the initial 5-point calibration within 15% for quantitation analysis utilizing SW-846 methodology.

The instrumental detection limit, the linear range of the instrument, and interference effects must be established for each individual analyte on that particular instrument. The calibration is verified initially prior to sample analysis using an independent second source standard. Calibration verification standards are analyzed after every 10 samples using a midrange calibration check standard and must be within 15% of the expected value.

6.1.2 GC/MS analysis

Each day prior to analysis of samples, the instrument is tuned with bromofluorobenzene for volatile compounds and decafluorotriphenylphosphine for semivolatile compounds or other tuning criteria as specified by the method used. Mass spectral peaks must conform both in mass numbers and relative intensity to method-specified requirements before analyses can proceed.

The instrument is then calibrated for all target compounds. An initial calibration curve is produced to define the working range to establish criteria for identification. All GC/MS instruments are calibrated at five different concentrations for analytes of interest, using the procedures outlined in SW-846. Method system performance check compounds (SPCC's) must show a minimum mean response factor and method calibration check compounds (CCC) must show a relative standard deviation (RSD) less than the method specified standard for the initial calibration to be considered valid. On a daily basis, SPCC's must meet the same criteria relevant for the initial calibration and CCCs must show a minimum percent drift relative to the expected concentration of the CCC to be considered valid. This initial calibration is evaluated on a daily basis to ensure that the system is within calibration. If the daily standard does not meet the

established criteria, the system is recalibrated. These procedures will be modified for selective ion monitoring.

Following a successful tune, the initial five-point calibration is verified by a single mid-range concentration standard. The calibration is verified daily prior to sample analysis using an independent second source standard. This initial calibration can be utilized as long as the calibration verification remains valid.

6.1.3 Inductively Coupled Argon Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectrometry (ICPES) Metals

Plasma emission spectrophotometry, also termed inductively coupled argon plasma (ICP) spectrometry, is calibrated daily using either one standard solution and one blank or a four-point calibration (3 levels plus blank). For the single standard calibration, the calibration standard must be within the demonstrated linear range of the instrument. The instrumental detection limit, the linear range of the instrument, and interference effects must be established for each individual analyte on that particular instrument. The linear range is verified at the time of the analysis by analyzing the highest calibration standard as a sample, the results of which must be within $\pm 5\%$ of its true value. The calibration is verified initially prior to sample analysis using an independent second source standard at a concentration mid-range of the calibration. Continuing calibration checks are analyzed after every 10 samples using a mid-range calibration check standard and must be within $\pm 10\%$ of the expected value. Sensitivity is established at the lower calibration level by analyzing a low level standard at the QL (3 to 5 times the MDL). Calibration blanks are analyzed after all calibration check standards and no analytes may be detected above one-half the QL. An interelement check standard is analyzed at the beginning and end of each analytical run, to verify that interelement and background correction factors have remained constant. Results outside of the established criteria trigger reanalysis of samples.

6.1.4 Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy

The instrument must be calibrated and checked for contamination before each set of samples. An initial calibration (ICAL) consists of a minimum of a blank and three calibration standards. The least concentrated standard will be at a concentration corresponding to the QL. The remaining standards will define the working range of the instrument. A linear regression fit of the calibration data must yield a correlation coefficient must be at least 0.995. Failure to meet these criteria will require recalibration and possible preparation of a new set of standards. Prior to sample analysis, an initial calibration verification (ICV), consisting of a second source standard, and an initial calibration blank (ICB) will be analyzed to verify the quantitation and to detect any contamination. A continuing calibration verification (CCV) at a mid-curve

concentration and CCB will be analyzed every 10 samples and at the end of analytical sequence. If the CCV value varies from the predicted concentration by more than + 10% then the analysis must be stopped. The problem must be identified and corrected, and rerun the impacted samples. All samples must be bracketed by calibration standards that meet the stated criteria.

6.2 Standard and Reagent Preparation

A critical element in the generation of quality data is the purity and traceability of the standard solutions and reagents used in the analytical operations. The preparation and maintenance of standards and reagents will be performed per the specified analytical methods presented in Section 5.0. The laboratory shall continually monitor the quality of reagents and standard solutions through a series of well-documented standard operating procedures (SOPs). In general, SOPs for standards preparation should incorporate the following items:

- Documentation and labeling of date received, lot number, date opened, and expiration date;
- Documentation of traceability;
- Preparation, storage, and labeling of stock and working solutions; and
- Establishing and documenting expiration dates and disposal of unusable standards.

Primary reference standards and standard solutions used by the laboratory are to be obtained from the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or other reliable commercial sources to ensure the highest level of purity possible. All standards and standard solutions shall be catalogued to identify the supplier, lot number, purity/concentration, receipt/preparation date, preparer's name, method of preparation, expiration date, and all other pertinent information included in the specific SOP.

Standard solutions and reagents are validated prior to use. Validation procedures can range from a check for chromatographic purity to verification of the concentration of the standard using a standard prepared at a different time, concentration or source. Reagents are examined for purity by subjecting an aliquot or subsample to the analytical method in which it will be used; for example, every lot of dichloromethane (for organic extractables) is analyzed for undesirable contaminants prior to use in the laboratory. Stock and working standards are checked regularly for signs of deterioration, such as discoloration, formation of precipitates, or change in concentration.

6.3 Field Quality Control Checks

Quality control checks in the field will include the collection of field duplicate, equipment rinsate and temperature blank samples. These QC checks are described in Section 4.2 of the FSP.

6.4 Laboratory Quality Control Checks

The Project Laboratories will have a QA/QC program that monitors data quality with internal QC checks. Internal QC checks are used to answer two questions:

- 1) Are laboratory operations in-control, (i.e., operating within acceptable QC guidelines), during data generation?
- 2) What effect does the sample matrix have on the data being generated?

Laboratory performance QC is based on the use of a standard control matrix to generate precision and accuracy data that are compared, on a daily basis, to control limits. This information, in conjunction with method blank data, is used to assess daily laboratory performance.

The second question is addressed with matrix-specific QC. Matrix-specific QC is based on the use of an actual environmental sample for precision and accuracy determinations and commonly relies on the analysis of matrix spikes, matrix spike duplicates, and surrogate standards. This information, supplemented with field blank results, is used to assess the effect of the matrix and field conditions on analytical data.

Laboratory performance QC will be provided as a standard part of every routine analysis. Matrix-specific QC frequency will be required per the tables in Attachment A. A brief summary of the required QC samples follows. The type and frequency of QC samples performed by the laboratory will be according to the specified analytical method.

6.4.1 Analytical Batch (Preparation Batch)

The analytical batch is defined as a set of samples that are extracted/analyzed concurrently or sequentially. The analytical batch will not exceed 20 samples. Significant gaps (greater than two hours) in the analytical sequence will result in the termination of the previous sequence and the initiation of a new analytical sequence. The analytical batch shall be analyzed sequentially on a single instrument. The practice of "holding a batch open" and performing a single set of batch QC samples for all analyses performed during that period is unacceptable.

The laboratory shall, at a minimum, analyze internal QC samples at the frequency specified in this QAPP for all analytical methods. These QC samples for each analytical batch

shall include method blanks (MB) and laboratory control samples (LCS). Definitions for the QC samples described above are provided in Chapter 1, Update III to EPA SW-846. The matrix used for LCS analyses shall be reagent grade water for aqueous analyses and reagent sand for soil/sediment matrices.

Second column confirmation for all GC sample analyses involving identification of discrete peaks with detected concentrations will be required, as per the methods. Second column confirmation is not required for concentrations reported between the MDL and the QL.

6.4.2 Blanks

Two types of blanks routinely analyzed in the laboratory are method blanks and reagent blanks. Method blanks and reagent/solvent blanks are used to assess laboratory procedures as possible sources of sample contamination.

Method or preparation blanks for all samples consist of deionized water or reagent sand that is subjected to the entire analytical procedure, including extraction, distillation, digestion, etc., as appropriate for the analytical method being utilized. One method blank will be analyzed for each analytical batch (minimum of one per day; one every 12 hours for GC/MS analyses). If the blank does not meet acceptance criteria, the source of contamination will be investigated and appropriate corrective action will be taken and documented. Investigation includes an evaluation of the data to determine the extent and effect of the contamination on the sample results. Corrective actions may include reanalysis of the blank and/or reparation and reanalysis of the blank and all associated samples. No method blank may exhibit a detected concentration greater than the quantitation limit. However, exceptions may be made when the analyte is not detected in the related sample. Sample results are not corrected for blank contamination unless required by the analytical method.

Reagent/solvent blanks consist of individual reagents or solvents subjected to the entire analytical procedure as appropriate for the analytical method being utilized. The blanks are only used if contamination problems are indicated by the method blank or if a new lot of materials are being checked before use.

6.4.3 Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) are used as a means of evaluating the efficiency of the analytical process. As discussed above, LCS is used to generate precision and accuracy data that are compared, on a daily basis, to control limits. Laboratory control samples are subjected to the entire sample procedure, including extraction, digestion, etc., as appropriate for the analytical method utilized. They are generally introduced into an analytical batch (20 samples)

immediately before extraction or analysis. LCS samples will be performed for both inorganic and organic laboratory methods.

6.4.4 Matrix Spikes and Matrix Spike Duplicates

A Matrix Spike (MS) is an environmental sample to which known concentrations of analytes have been added. The MS is taken through the entire analytical procedure and the recovery of the analytes is calculated. Results are expressed as percent recovery. The MS is used to evaluate the effect of the sample matrix on the accuracy of the analysis.

A Matrix Spike Duplicate (MSD) is a duplicate of the environmental sample described above, each of which is spiked with known concentrations of analytes. The two spiked samples are processed separately and the results compared to determine the effects of the matrix on the precision and accuracy of the analysis. Results are expressed as relative percent difference (RPD) and percent recovery (%R).

6.4.5 Surrogate Recoveries and Standard Additions

Surrogates are organic compounds which are similar to the analytes of interest in chemical behavior, but which are not normally found in environmental samples. Surrogates are added to samples to monitor the effect of the matrix on the accuracy of the analysis for each sample. Results are reported in percent recovery. Laboratories routinely add surrogates to samples requiring GC or GC/MS analysis and report these surrogate recoveries to the client. The laboratory does not modify its operations based on surrogate recoveries in environmental samples. However, obvious problems with sample preparation and analysis (e.g. evaporation to dryness, leaking septum, etc.) which can lead to poor surrogate spike recoveries must be ruled out prior to attributing low surrogate recoveries to matrix effects.

Standard Additions is the practice of adding a series of known amounts of an analyte to an environmental sample. The fortified samples are then analyzed and the recovery of the analytes calculated. The practice of standard addition is generally used with metals analysis and wet chemistry to determine the effect of the sample matrix on the accuracy of the analyses.

6.4.6 Calibration Standard

A calibration standard is prepared in the laboratory by dissolving a known amount of a purchased pure compound or standard mix in an appropriate matrix. The final concentration calculated from the known quantities is the true value of the standard. The results obtained from these standards are used to generate a standard curve and thereby quantify the compound in the environmental sample.

6.4.7 Reference Standard

A reference standard is prepared in the same manner as a calibration standard or may be obtained from National Institute of Standards and Testing (NIST). A reference standard is obtained from a source independent of the source of the calibration standard. The concentration of the known quantity is the “true” value of the standard. A reference standard is not carried through the same process used for the environmental samples, but is analyzed without digestion or extraction. A reference standard result is used to validate an existing concentration calibration standard file or calibration curve. The reference standard can provide information on the accuracy of the instrumental analytical method independent of various sample matrices.

6.4.8 Laboratory Performance Evaluation Samples

At a minimum the contract laboratory will participate in at least one performance evaluation program.

The performance evaluation samples are single blind (prepared by the laboratory from ambulated standards) and are often associated with the regular laboratory audits performed by the agencies.

6.5 Corrective Action

The Sampling Team Leader is responsible for initiating corrective action and for implementation of all corrective actions with respect to the field sampling operations. The laboratory QA Director in consultation with the Project Chemist is responsible for implementing corrective actions in the laboratory. It is their combined responsibility to see that all analytical and sampling procedures are followed as specified and that the data generated meet the acceptance criteria. The acceptance criteria for some of the QC samples (LCS, surrogate recoveries) will be those calculated by the laboratory as control limits. The number of samples used to develop the statistical control limits shall be all those analyzed within the previous six months or a minimum of 20 data points. The comparison control limits in Attachment A are to ensure that the laboratory can produce data with acceptable accuracy. If the laboratory statistical limits are consistently different from the comparison limits, a different laboratory shall be selected for that analytical method, or an alternate analytical or preparation method shall be selected that increases the accuracy of the laboratory. Corrective action procedures are summarized for each method in Attachment A.

Corrective actions for the laboratory may include, but are not limited to:

- Reanalyzing samples;

- Correcting laboratory procedures;
- Recalibrating instruments using freshly prepared standards;
- Replacing solvents or other reagents that give unacceptable blank values;
- Training laboratory personnel in correct sample preparation and analysis procedures; and
- Accepting data with an acknowledged and documented level of uncertainty.

Whenever corrective action is deemed necessary, the Laboratory Director will ensure that the following steps are taken:

- The problem is defined;
- The cause of the problem is investigated and determined;
- Appropriate corrective action is determined; and
- Corrective action is implemented and its effectiveness verified.

6.6 Documentation

All calibration information, instrument maintenance and repair are recorded by the laboratory on appropriate forms developed for SW-846 procedures. Out-of-control analyses are generally described on a QA/QC discrepancy form and submitted to the laboratory supervisor for corrective action. Copies are distributed to the laboratory QA coordinator and laboratory director for approval, and to the case file. The calibration information is filed with the raw data.

7.0 DATA REDUCTION, VALIDATION AND REPORTING

7.1 Laboratory

7.1.1 Data Reduction and Validation

All analytical data generated within the laboratories shall be reviewed prior to report generation to assure the validity of the reported data. The data validation process consists of data generation, reduction, and three levels of documented review. In each stage, the review process will be documented by the signature of the reviewer and the date reviewed.

The analyst who generates the analytical data will have the prime responsibility for the correctness and completeness of the data. All data will be generated and reduced following protocols specified in laboratory SOPs. Each analyst will review the quality of his or her work based on an established set of guidelines outlined in the SOPs. The analyst will review the data package to ensure that:

- The correct samples were analyzed and reported in appropriate units,
- Preservation and holding time requirements were met,
- Sample preparation information is correct and complete,
- Appropriate SOPs have been followed,
- Analytical results are correct and complete,
- QC samples are within established control limits,
- Blanks are within appropriate QC limits,
- Special sample preparation and analytical requirements have been met, and
- Documentation is complete (e.g., all anomalies in the preparation and analysis have been documented, anomaly forms are complete; holding times are documented, etc.).

The data reduction and validation steps shall be documented, signed and dated by the analyst. The analyst will then pass the data package to an independent reviewer, who will perform an independent review of the data package. This review is also to be conducted according to an established set of guidelines and to be structured to ensure that:

- Calibration data are scientifically sound, appropriate to the method, and completely documented,

- QC samples are within established guidelines,
- Qualitative identification of sample components is correct
- Quantitative results are correct,
- Documentation is complete and correct (e.g., anomalies in the preparation and analysis have been documented; anomaly forms are complete; holding times are documented, etc.), and
- The data are ready for incorporation into the final report; and the data package is complete and ready for data archive.

The review is to be structured so that all calibration data and QC sample results are reviewed and all of the analytical results from 10% of the samples are checked back to the bench sheet. If no problems are found with the data package, the review is complete. If any problems are found with the data package, an additional 10% of the samples will be checked to the bench sheet. This process will continue until no errors are found or until the data package has been reviewed in its entirety.

Data reviews shall be documented and the signature of the reviewer and the date of review recorded. The reviewed data are then approved for release and a final report is prepared. Before the report is released to the client, the data are reviewed for completeness and to ensure that the data satisfy the overall objectives of the project. The Laboratory Project Manager typically does this review.

Each step of this review process involves evaluation of data quality based on both the results of the QC data and the professional judgment of those conducting the review. This application of technical knowledge and experience to the evaluation of the data is essential in ensuring that data of high quality are generated consistently.

7.1.2 Data Reporting

At the conclusion of all analytical work for this project, the primary laboratory will submit a comprehensive certificate of analysis. The final certificates of analysis will be submitted no later than 21 days after the last sample has been submitted to the laboratory for the project. All samples shall be reported in a legally defensible package and electronic data deliverable (EDD) format consistent with the USACE, Sacramento District Automated Data Review (ADR) format. The data package may be submitted in a read-only electronic file, compatible with Adobe

Acrobat reader.

The data package for organics analyses will consist of a case narrative, chain-of-custody documentation, cooler receipt form, summary of results for environmental samples, summary of QA/QC results, and the data. Legible copies of all data will be organized systematically on numbered pages. The data for compound identification and quantitation must be sufficient to support all results presented in other sections of the data package. This section of the data package will include legible copies of the data for environmental samples (arranged in increasing order of field ID), and instrument calibration, QA/QC analyses, sample extraction and cleanup logs, instrument analysis logs for each instrument used. Instrument analysis logs are particularly important because they provide the basic link between all sample analyses and QC information (calibration, matrix spike, etc.). Instrument analysis logs for all instruments used for sample data for each analysis will include measurement printouts and quantitation reports for each instrument used.

Raw data will be available for further inspection, if required, and maintained in the central job file. All records related to the analytical effort are maintained at the primary laboratory in secured filing cabinets (i.e., cost information, scheduling, and custody). All records are maintained for five years after the final report is issued. Types of records to be maintained for the project include the following:

- Chain-of-custody records, including: information on the sampler's name, date of sampling, type of sampling, location of sampling, location of sampling station, number and type of containers used, signature of sampler relinquishing samples to non-contract personnel (e.g., Federal Express agent) with the date and time of transfer noted, signature of primary laboratory sample custodian receiving samples with date and time noted
- Cooler receipt form documenting sample conditions upon arrival at the laboratory.
- Any discrepancy/deficiency report forms due to problems encountered during sampling, transportation, or analysis
- Sample destruction authorization forms containing information on the manner of final disposal of samples upon completion of analysis
- All laboratory notebooks including raw data readings, calibration details, QC checks, etc

- Hard copies of data system printouts (chromatograms, mass spectra, ICP data files, etc.)
- Tabulation of analytical results with supporting quality control information

7.1.2.1 Case Narrative

The case narrative will be written and the laboratory director or his/her designee will authorize the release of data. Items to be included in the case narrative are the field sample ID with the corresponding laboratory ID, parameters analyzed in each sample and the methodology used (EPA method numbers or other citation), detailed description of all problems encountered and corrective actions taken, discussion of possible reasons for out-of-control QA/QC results, and observations regarding any occurrences which may affect sample integrity or data quality.

7.1.2.2 Chain-of-Custody Documentation

Legible copies of chain-of-custody forms for each sample will be maintained in the data package. Cooler log-in sheets will be associated with the corresponding chain-of-custody form. Any integral laboratory-tracking document will also be included.

7.1.2.3 Summary of Environmental Results

For each environmental sample analysis, this summary shall include field ID and corresponding laboratory ID, sample matrix, date of sample extraction (if applicable), date and time of analysis, identification of the instrument used for analysis, instrument specifications, weight or volume of the sample used for analysis/extraction, dilution or concentration factor used for the sample extract, method detection limit or sample quantitation limit, definitions of any data qualifiers used, and analytical results.

7.1.2.4 Summary of QA/QC Results

The following QA/QC results will be presented in summary form. Details specified in Section 7.1.2.3 also will be included for the summary of QA/QC results. Acceptance limits for all categories of QC criteria will be provided with the data.

7.1.2.4.1 Organic Analyses (General)

The summary of QA/QC results for organic analyses will include:

- Initial Calibration - The concentrations of the standards used for analysis and the date and time of analysis. The response factor, percent relative standard deviation (%RSD), and retention time for each analyte (as applicable, GC, HPLC and GC/MS

analyses) will be included in initial calibration summaries. A statement should also be made about the samples or dates for which a single initial calibration applies.

- Daily Calibration and Mid-level Standard - The concentration of the calibration standard used for daily calibration and/or the mid-level calibration check will be reported. The response factor, percent difference, and retention time for each analyte will be reported (GC and GC/MS). Daily calibration information will be linked to sample analyses by summary.
- Method Blank Analyses - The concentrations of any analytes found in method blanks will be reported even if detected amounts are less than the QL. The environmental samples and QA/QC analyses associated with each method blank will be stated.
- Surrogate Standard Recovery - The name and concentration of each surrogate compound added will be detailed. The percent recovery of each surrogate compound in the samples, method blanks, matrix spike/matrix spike duplicates and other QA/QC analyses will be summarized with sample IDs such that the information can be linked to sample and QA/QC analyses.
- Precision and Accuracy - For matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate analyses, the sample results, spiked sample results, percent recovery, and RPD with the associated control limits will be detailed. For laboratory duplicate analyses, the RPD between duplicate analyses will be reported as applicable. For laboratory QC check and/or LCS analyses, the percent recovery and acceptable control limits for each analyte will be reported. All batch QC information will be linked to the corresponding sample groups.
- Compound Identification (GC, HPLC, GC/MS): The retention times and the concentrations of each analyte detected in environmental and QC/QC samples will be reported for both primary and confirmation analyses. Mass spectra will also be included for reported detections in samples and for detections identified in the quantitation report, but ruled out during analyst review.
- Method Detection Limit (MDL): The MDL study result sheet will have laboratory heading, instrument identification, analysis date, spike level, average recovery, standard deviation and calculated MDL for each analyte.

In addition, the summary of QA/QC results for organic analyses will include the following information relating specifically to the method used.

7.1.2.4.2 GC and GC/MS Analyses

This section of the data package will include legible copies of the data for environmental samples (arranged in increasing order of field ID, primary and confirmation analyses). The raw data for each analysis will include chromatograms (with target compound, internal standard, and surrogate compounds labeled by name) with a quantitation report and/or area printout. GC/MS analyses will also include the mass spectra or ion chromatograms for each reported analyte.

7.1.2.4.3 Inorganic Analyses

The summary of QA/QC results for the inorganic analyses will include:

- Initial Calibration: The source of the calibration standards, true value concentrations, found concentrations, the percent recovery for each element analyzed, and the date and time of analysis will be reported.
- Continuing Calibration Verification: The source of the calibration standard, true value concentrations, found concentrations, the percent recovery for each element analyzed, and the date and time of analysis will be reported.
- Method Blank Analyses: The concentrations of any analytes found in initial calibration, continuing calibration blank, and in the preparation blank will be reported. The date and time of analysis also will be reported.
- Precision and Accuracy - Matrix Spikes and Sample Duplicates: For matrix spike analyses, the sample results, spiked sample results, percent recovery, spiking solution used, and the control range for each element will be detailed. For post digestion spikes, the concentrations of the spiked sample, the sample result, the spiking solution added, and recovery and control limits will be detailed. For laboratory duplicates, the original concentration, duplicate concentration, relative percent difference, and control limits will be detailed. Date and time for all analyses will be recorded.
- Precision and Accuracy - Laboratory Control Samples: The source of the laboratory control sample, true value concentrations, found concentrations, percent recovery for each element analyzed, and the date and time of analysis will be reported.

- **Method of Standard Additions (MSA):** This summary must be included when MSA analyses are required for analysis by Graphite Furnace AA. The absorbance values and the corresponding concentration values, the final analyte concentrations, and correlation coefficients will be reported for all analyses. Date and time of analysis will be recorded for all analyses.
- **Method Detection Limit (MDL):** The MDL study result sheet will have laboratory heading, instrument identification, analysis date, spike level, average recovery, standard deviation and calculated MDL for each analyte.

7.1.3 External Data Validation and Quality Assurance Reports

The laboratory data will be validated using guidelines in Attachment C. The validation guidelines are based on EPA SW-846 methods and the EPA National Functional Guidelines for Organic and Inorganic Data Review. The Project Chemist, or designee, will review the data and prepare a Quality Control Summary Report (QCSR). The QCSR presents all laboratory and field QC results and any qualifiers applied to the data. The Project Chemist will discuss the data usability and precision based upon all information that affects the quality of the data (not just laboratory QC results) in a Chemical Data Quality Assessment Report (CDQAR).

7.2 Field Activities

7.2.1 Data Reduction

Since no field screening equipment will be used during this sampling event, data reduction is not applicable.

7.2.2 Data Integrity

Integrity of information and data on field activities shall be maintained by the Project Leader. Integrity of the field sample custody is accomplished by the field staff, according to the sample custody procedures discussed in Section 5.0. This information is generated in the field and recorded in the project field logbook and on the sample chain-of-custody form, shall be verified before sample shipping, and confirmed at the laboratory upon their receipt of the samples.

7.2.3 Data Validation

Validation of information and data on field activities shall be conducted as a QC procedure by the Project Leader. The Project Manager shall review laboratory results and field data before

use. Field logbooks and chain-of-custody forms shall be crosschecked to each other and to the laboratory results to assure conformity of sample identification numbers. This information is compared to results of duplicate and blank samples, and field conditions at the time of sample collection will be taken into account when qualifying the sample analytical results.

Hardcopy analytical deliverable per Section 7.0 shall be presented to the USACE Project Chemist and the Data Management Supervisor. The originals shall be archived at the laboratory for a minimum of ten years. The laboratory shall provide analytical data in electronic data EDD format.

The USACE project chemist will validate the data using the ADR system software developed by Laboratory Data Consultants (LDC). The USACE project chemist shall develop the EDD project library in accordance with the ADR format, and QAPP requirements herein. The library shall be forwarded to the laboratory prior to start of the fieldwork.

7.2.4 Data Storage

Field and laboratory data shall be stored in hard copy and floppy disk format (when applicable) as part of the project file. This information is retained in the project file until project completion and closeout. Upon project closeout, all records shall be archived for permanent storage.

8.0 PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE

To minimize downtime and interruption of analytical work, preventive maintenance is routinely performed on each analytical instrument. Each laboratory shall have detailed SOPs on file that describe preventive maintenance procedures and schedules. All service and maintenance will be conducted by qualified laboratory staff or under service agreement with the manufacturer or their approved agent. All repairs, adjustments, and calibrations will be documented in a maintenance notebook or data sheet that will be maintained in a permanent file. The instrument notebook will clearly document the date, the problem description, corrective action taken, results of actions, and the name of the person performing the work. Table 8-1 lists common laboratory preventative maintenance parameters for laboratory instrumentation.

Table 8-1. Routine Laboratory Instrument Maintenance

Instrument	Operation	Frequency
Gas Chromatography	Change septum Change injection port liner Change column Bake detectors	Daily when used Daily when used As needed (when standard response decreases or sample carryover is noted, approximately monthly) As needed (when standard response decreases or sample carryover is noted, approximately monthly)
GC/MS	Clean source	As needed (show reduced sensitivity)
Atomic Absorption Spectrometer	Warm up instrument for 30 min. Digital readout values checked; check gas flows, cell alignment, wavelength, Photo multiplier voltage and lamp voltage Tygon tubing replaced Change contact rings Replace optical lens	Daily when used Daily when used Quarterly or as needed Daily, as needed or when used 6 months, or if deterioration is observed
Balances	Calibrate by manufacturer	Annually / verify monthly
Ovens/Refrigerators	Check temperature	Daily

9.0 LABORATORY PROCEDURES USED TO ASSESS DATA QUALITY AND DETERMINE SENSITIVITY

9.1 Data Quality Assessment

The effectiveness of a QA program is measured by the quality of data generated by the laboratory. Data quality is judged in terms of its PARCC parameters as presented in Section 3.0. These terms are described as follows:

9.1.1 Precision

Precision is a measure of the reproducibility of analyses under a given set of conditions. Precision can be assessed by replicate measurements of duplicate control samples, reference materials, or environmental samples. The routine comparison of precision is measured by the relative percent different (RPD) between duplicate control sample measurements with control limits established at plus three standard deviations from the mean RPD of historical duplicate control sample data. The overall precision of a sampling event has a sampling and an analytical component. The following QC data will be collected to determine sampling and analytical precision:

- Laboratory Control Standards and duplicates (LCD/LCSD) as well as matrix spikes and matrix spike duplicates (MS/MSD) will be used as a measure the precision of the analytical process for organic analyses. LCS/LCSD and/or MS/MSD samples will be run on each batch of samples up to a maximum of 20.
- Field duplicate samples, submitted to the laboratory “blind”, measure the precision of the entire measurement system including sampling and analytical procedures. Field duplicate samples will be collected at a rate of 1 per 10 primary samples.
- Laboratory duplicates will be performed for every inorganic analytical batch. The maximum size of each batch shall not exceed 20 samples.

The RPD between the two samples may be used to estimate precision where:

$$\text{RPD} = \frac{|D_1 - D_2|}{(D_1 + D_2)} \times 200$$

RPD = *absolute relative percent difference*

D_1 = *first sample value*

D_2 = *second sample value (duplicate)*

Note: If the laboratory determines that failure to meet QC criteria for accuracy or precision is a result of objectively verifiable matrix effects, no further re-extractions will be required. However, the narrative must contain an explicit description of the laboratory's rationale in this regard with reference to objectively verifiable features of raw data. The sufficiency of the laboratory's explanation will be determined by the Project Manager or an appointed representative.

9.1.2 Accuracy

Accuracy is a determination of how close the measurement is to the true value. Accuracy can be assessed using laboratory control samples, standard reference materials, or spiked environmental samples. Unless specified otherwise in special contracts, the laboratory shall monitor accuracy by comparing laboratory control sample results with control limits established at plus or minus three standard deviation units from the mean of historical laboratory control sample results. The accuracy of the data submitted for this project will be assessed in the following manner:

- Accuracy for each sample will be checked by calculating surrogate percent recoveries, as applicable.
- The percent recovery of matrix spikes, matrix spike duplicates, and/or laboratory control samples will be calculated.
- The level of target compounds that are found (if any) in laboratory method blanks will be checked. If a target compound is found above the practical quantitation limit in the method blank corresponding to a batch of samples and the same target compound is found in a sample, the data will not be background subtracted but will be flagged to indicate the result in the blank.

Accuracy is presented as percent recovery. Since accuracy is often determined from spiked samples, laboratories commonly report accuracy as

$$\% \text{ Recovery} = \frac{R}{S} \times 100$$

Where: S = spiked concentration

R = reported concentration

Note: If the laboratory determines that failure to meet QC criteria for accuracy or precision is a result of objectively verifiable matrix effects, no further re-extractions will be required. However, the narrative must contain an explicit description of the laboratory's rationale in this regard with reference to objectively verifiable features of raw data. The sufficiency of the laboratory's explanation will be determined by the Project Manager or an appointed representative.

9.1.3 Representativeness

Representativeness is a qualitative parameter that reflects the extent to which a given sample is characteristic of a given population at a specific location or under a given environmental condition. Representativeness is best satisfied by making certain that sampling locations are selected properly, a sufficient number of samples are collected, and an appropriate sampling technique is employed. Variations at a sampling point will be evaluated based on the results of field duplicates. Some samples may require analysis of multiple phases to obtain representative results. Analytical data should represent the sample analyzed regardless of the heterogeneity of the original sample matrix. Sample representativeness will also be evaluated on the basis of results from method blanks and trip blanks.

9.1.4 Completeness

Completeness will be evaluated qualitatively and quantitatively. The qualitative evaluation of completeness will be determined as a function of all events contributing to the sampling event including items such as correct handling of COC forms, incorporation of QC samples at the appropriate frequency, etc. The quantitative description of completeness will be defined as the percentage of contract laboratory controlled QC parameters that are acceptable. The goals for completeness are as follows: contract (95%), analytical (85%), technical (95%), and field sampling completeness (100%). Contract completeness is a measure of the results that meets contract requirements relative to the number of reported results expressed as a percentage. Analytical completeness is a measure of all unqualified results relative to the number of reported results expressed as a percentage. Technical completeness is a measure of the usable results relative to the number of reported results expressed as a percentage. Field sampling completeness is a measure of the number of samples collected relative to the number of samples

planned expressed as a percentage.

9.1.5 Comparability

Comparability expresses the confidence with which one data set can be compared to another data set measuring the same property. To ensure comparability, field procedures will be standardized and field operations will adhere to standard operating procedures. Laboratory data comparability will be assured by use of established and approved analytical methods, consistency in the basis of analysis (wet weight, volume, etc.), and consistency in reporting units ($\mu\text{g/L}$, mg/kg , etc.). Analysis of standard reference materials will follow USEPA or other standard analytical methods, which utilize standard units of measurement, methods of analysis, and reporting format.

9.2 Sensitivity

9.2.1 Method Detection Limit (MDL)

The method detection limit (MDL) is the lowest concentration at which a specific analyte in a matrix can be measured and reported with 99-percent confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero. MDLs are experimentally determined for each target analyte of the method. Each individual instrument will maintain a current MDL study. MDLs are based on the results of seven spikes of **clean matrix** at the estimated MDL and are statistically calculated in accordance with the Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations Part 136 (40 CFR 136), Attachment B. The standard deviation of the seven replicates is determined and multiplied by 3.143 (i.e., the 99-percent confidence interval from the one-sided student t-test). The MDLs are updated annually and whenever significant instrument maintenance is performed (i.e., GC Column, AA lamp, etc.).

9.2.2 Quantitation Limit (QL)

The quantitation limit is defined by the lowest concentration in the multi-point initial calibration. The QL will be greater than 3 times the MDL, and is the lowest level for quantitation decisions based on individual measurements for a given method and representative matrix. The QL for this project is based on a project-specific action level and the capability of the method and laboratory. Detected results above the MDL but below the QL, are qualified with a J flag due to the very low comparator values. The J flag will denote the sample results as below the QL and as qualitative, estimated concentrations. This increases the probability of false positive results at these low concentrations, especially for the sample matrix anticipated for this project. However,

analyst judgment will be used to determine if an apparent detected value should be reported or appears to be a false positive due to the sample matrix (e.g., from baseline “noise”).

If dilution to bring the reported concentration of a single compound of interest within the linear range of the calibration, results in non-detect values for all other analytes with detected concentrations in the initial sample analysis, the results of the original run and the dilution will be reported with appropriate notations in the narrative of the report. Matrix effects (i.e., highly contaminated samples requiring dilution for analysis, dilution to bring detected levels within the range of calibration, and matrix interference requiring elevation of detection limits) will be considered in assessing compliance with the requirements for sensitivity. Cleanup procedures will be used to minimize interferences and lower the QLs to those required. In addition, the sample aliquot will be increased from the standard mass to make up for the increased QLs when data is reported on a dry weight basis (these samples are expected to be at least 50% moisture). This increased aliquot size may also increase the matrix interferences, as they too will have increased in mass. The QLs required by this project are listed in the method-specific tables in Attachment B of this document.

10.0 CORRECTIVE ACTION FOR UNACCEPTABLE QUALITY CONTROL DATA

10.1 Field Activities

All technical staff will be responsible for reporting all suspected technical nonconformances by initiating a nonconformance report of any issued deliverable or document. All staff will be responsible for reporting all suspected QA nonconformance by initiating a nonconformance report.

The Project Leader will be responsible for ensuring that corrective actions for nonconformance are implemented by:

- Evaluating all reported nonconformance;
- Controlling additional work on nonconforming items;
- Determining disposition or action to be taken;
- Maintaining a log of nonconformance;
- Reviewing nonconformance reports;
- Evaluating disposition or action taken; and
- Ensuring nonconformance reports are included in the final site documentation in document control.

Any staff member who discovers or suspects a nonconformance, which is an identified or suspected deficiency in an approved document, is responsible for initiating a nonconformance report. The Project Leader will ensure that no additional work, which is dependent on the nonconforming activity, is performed until the nonconformance report is corrected. The Project Leader will also be responsible for carrying out corrective action as initiated by the program QA manager. Each nonconformance report will be evaluated and the disposition and action taken will be recorded.

10.2 Laboratory

When errors, deficiencies, or out-of-control situations exist, the QA program provides systematic procedures, called "corrective actions", to resolve problems and restore proper functioning to the analytical system (see section 5.0).

Laboratory personnel are alerted that corrective actions may be necessary if:

- QC data are outside the acceptable windows for precision and accuracy;
- Blanks, duplicate control samples or single control samples contain contaminants above acceptable levels;
- Undesirable trends are detected in spike recoveries or RPD between duplicates;
- There are unusual changes in detection limits;
- Deficiencies are detected by the QA department during internal or external audits or from the results of performance evaluation samples; or
- Inquiries concerning data quality are received from clients.

Corrective action procedures are often handled at the bench level by the analyst, who reviews the preparation or extraction procedure for possible errors, checks the instrument calibration, spike and calibration mixes, instrument sensitivity, and so on. If the problem persists or cannot be identified, the matter is referred to the laboratory supervisor, manager and/or QA department for further investigation. Once resolved, full documentation of the corrective action procedure is filed with the project records.

10.3 Non-routine Occurrence Reports

Nonconforming equipment, items, activities, conditions and unusual incidents that could affect compliance with project requirements shall be identified, controlled, and reported in a timely manner. A nonconformance is defined as a malfunction, failure, deficiency, or deviation that renders the quality of an item unacceptable or indeterminate. The nonconformance Report shall describe the finding on the form provided for this purpose and notify the Technical Team Leader. Each nonconformance shall be reviewed and a disposition given for the item, activity, or condition. The disposition of a nonconformance shall be documented and approved by the Project Manager for the issuance of the nonconformance.

In the laboratory, the Laboratory Project Manager is responsible for assessment of QC sample information. If data fall outside accepted limits, the Laboratory Project Manager shall immediately notify the Laboratory Manager and the responsible group leader. If the situation is not corrected and an out-of-control condition occurs or is expected to occur, the Laboratory

Project Manager shall notify the Project Chemist and the Project Manager. The Laboratory Manager, Laboratory Project Manager, and the group leaders are responsible for identifying the source of the nonconformance and initiating corrective action. Completion of corrective action should be evidenced by data returning to prescribed acceptable limits. Evidence should be provided to the Project Manager to close out the nonconformance.

The modification, repair, re-work, or replacement of nonconforming equipment, items, or activities utilized either in the field or in the laboratory shall require the re-verification of acceptability. The Project Manager and QA/QC Officer shall concur on whether these actions require immediate (within 72 hours) corrective action be completed and verified before site work continues. Since nonconformances usually occur in the field, the Sampling Team Leader or his designee shall normally complete the corrective action.

The equipment, item, or activity that has the deficiency may be temporarily stopped while the nonconformance is being investigated. If, in the opinion of the Technical Team Leader or Project Manager, the nonconformance does not significantly affect the technical quality or use of the work, the work may continue pending resolution of the nonconformance. The basis for such decisions shall be documented on the Nonconformance Report and submitted to the QA/QC officer for review and approval. The documentation shall include the statement that the decision was made prior to continuing with the work. The records of nonconformance and their disposition shall be kept in the project files.

At a minimum, all variances, cost or schedule impacts, shall indicate the corrective action taken or planned and nonconformances shall be discussed in the technical reports.

The laboratory will send written reports of all significant non-routine occurrence events to the project chemist within 48 hours of occurrence of non-routine events for laboratory work. These reports will identify and fill out the Nonconformance Report:

- the problem,
- corrective actions taken,
- verbal / written instructions from the USACE project chemist regarding re-extraction and reanalysis of project samples and/or other applicable corrective actions to be taken.

Significant events are occurrences impacting cost of work, schedule of work, and quality of environmental analytical data.

<u>Pre-Remedial Action Sampling, CSM, Hamilton AAF</u> NONCONFORMANCE REPORT			
PROJECT NUMBER		NR NO.	
PROJECT NAME		PAGE	OF
_____		DATE: _____	_____

1. NONCONFORMANCE DESCRIPTION			
IDENTIFIED BY: _____		DATE: _____	

2. PROPOSED CORRECTIVE ACTION, INCLUDING INITIATION AND COMPLETION DATES			
TO BE PERFORMED BY: _____			

3. APPROVAL FOR PROPOSED CORRECTIVE ACTION			
Project Manager: _____		DATE: _____	
QA/QC Officer: _____		DATE: _____	

4. CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN (IF DIFFERENT FROM THAT PROPOSED)			

5. CORRECTIVE ACTION COMPLETE			
PERFORMED BY: _____		DATE: _____	
VERIFIED BY: _____		DATE: _____	

CC:

PROGRAM MANAGER:

PROJECT MANAGER:

QA/QC OFFICER:

OTHER:

11.0 REFERENCES

11.1 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

EPA 2001. *EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans*, EPA QA/R-5, Final Interim Final, March.

EPA 2000a. *Guidance for Data Assessment*, USEPA QA/G-9, Final, July.

EPA 2000b. *Guidance on the Data Quality Objectives Process*, USEPA QA/G-4, Final, September.

EPA 1998. *Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste*, USEPA SW-846, Third Edition, (Update III), June.

National Functional Guidelines for Inorganics Data Review, USEPA Contract Laboratory Program, EPA 540/R-94/013.

National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review, USEPA Contract Laboratory Program, EPA 540/R-94/012.

11.2 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

Requirements for the Preparation of Sampling and Analysis Plans, Engineering Manual EM. 200-1-3, 1998.

Chemical Data Quality Management for Hazardous Waste Remedial Activities, Engineering Regulation 1110-1-263, October 1990.

11.3 Other Documents

CH2MHILL 2003. *Coastal Salt Marsh Focused Feasibility Study Report*, Hamilton Army Airfield, Novato, California. June.

Record of Decision Remedial Action Plan, Hamilton Main Airfield Parcel, September 2003.

ATTACHMENT A

Table A-1
Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW6010B (Metals)

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW6010B (or SW6020)	Metals	Calibration	Daily	Low level check standard $\pm 20\%$, or $r > 0.995$	1) Identify and repeat analysis for outlying points 2) Recalculate using valid points
		ICV/CCV	Daily: before sample analysis, every 10 samples, and at the end of the analytical sequence	% Recovery $\pm 10\%$	1) Reanalyze ICV/CCV 2) If still out, identify and correct problem 3) Recalibrate and reanalyze all samples since last valid CCV
		ICB/CCB	Beginning of sequence, every 10 samples, and at end of sequence	Analytes < MDL	1) Reanalyze ICB/CCB 2) If still out, identify and correct problem 3) Recalibrate and reanalyze all samples since last valid CCB
		Method Blank	1 per preparation batch	All analytes < $\frac{1}{2}$ QL	1) Investigate possible contamination source 2) Take appropriate corrective action 3) Repeat instrument blank analysis 4) Redigest and reanalyze all samples processed with a contaminated blank at no cost to USACE, unless analyte is not detected in associated samples or present at greater than 10x blank concentration. 5) Flag sample results associated with blank contamination
		ICSA ICSB	Beginning and end of analytical sequence	% Recovery $\pm 20\%$ for target analytes	1) Investigate cause 2) Correct problem 3) Reanalyze ICSA and ICSB and all samples analyzed before or after the non-compliant ICS

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW6010B (or SW6020)	Metals	LCS	1 per sample preparation batch	Comparison recovery limits 80-120%	1) Reanalyze LCS. 2) If still out identify and correct problem. 3) Reprepare and reanalyze affected samples.
		Matrix Spike (MS) (level of spike must be less than the mid-level standard of the calibration curve)	1 per preparation batch	Comparison recovery limits 75-125%	1) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 2) If no interference is evident re-extract and reanalyze MS once. 3) If still out report both sets of data.
		Matrix Duplicate (D) or Matrix Spike Duplicate (MSD)	1 per preparation batch	RPD <25	1) Recalculate result; if still out: 2) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 3) If no interference is evident reanalyze affected sample(s) and narrate any outliers.
		Post Digestion Spike	When matrix spike fails	Recovery 75-125%	Perform method of standard addition for all samples with similar matrix
		Serial Dilution (SD) (1:4 dilution)	As needed, when result is > 50x the IDL	Agreement between undiluted and diluted results $\pm 10\%$	Flag result
		Method of Standard Addition (MSA)	As needed for samples with confirmed matrix effects	$r > 0.995$	Consider alternative sample preparation or analysis methods to reduce interference and discuss with project chemist
		QL	Low point on initial calibration curve.	QLs established shall not exceed those required by project; Refer to accompanying table.	QLs that exceed established criteria shall be submitted to USACE for approval prior to any project samples analyses

All corrective actions associated with USACE project work shall be documented and the records maintained by the laboratory.

Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, SW-846, USEPA, December 1998.

CV	= Continuing Calibration Verification	ICV	= Initial Calibration Verification	DL	= Detection Limit
QL	= Quantitation Limit	GC	= Gas Chromatograph	LCS	= Laboratory Control Sample
RF	= Response Factor	MDL	= Method Detection Limit	RPD	= Relative Percent Difference
MS	= Matrix Spike	RSD	= Relative Standard Deviation	RT	= Retention time
MSD	= Matrix Spike Duplicate				

Table A-2
Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW7471A (Mercury)

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW7471A	Mercury	Calibration (5 standards and blank)	Daily	$r > 0.995$	1) Identify and repeat analysis for outlying points 2) Recalculate using valid points
		ICV/CCV	Daily: before sample analysis, every 10 samples, and at the end of the analytical sequence	ICV: % Recovery $\pm 10\%$ CCV: % Recovery $\pm 20\%$	1) Reanalyze ICV/CCV 2) If still out, identify and correct problem 3) Recalibrate and reanalyze all samples since last valid CCV
		ICB/CCB	Beginning of sequence, every 10 samples, and at end of sequence	Analytes < MDL	1) Reanalyze ICB/CCB 2) If still out, identify and correct problem 3) Recalibrate and reanalyze all samples since last valid CCB
		Method Blank (MB)	1 per sample preparation batch	Analytes < $\frac{1}{2}$ QL	1) Investigate possible contamination source 2) Take appropriate corrective action 3) Repeat instrument blank analysis 4) Redigest and reanalyze all samples processed with a contaminated blank at no cost to USACE, unless analyte is not detected in associated samples or present at greater than 10x blank concentration. 5) Flag sample results associated with blank contamination
		LCS	1 per sample preparation batch	Comparison recovery limits 80-120%	1) Reanalyze LCS. 2) If still out identify and correct problem. 3) Reprepare and reanalyze affected samples.

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW7471A	Mercury	Matrix Spike (MS) (level of spike must be less than the mid-level standard of the calibration curve)	1 per preparation batch	Comparison recovery limits 80-120%	1) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 2) If no interference is evident re-extract and reanalyze MS once. 3) If still out report both sets of data.
		Matrix Duplicate (D) or Matrix Spike Duplicate (MSD)	1 per sample batch	RPD <20	1) Recalculate result; if still out: 2) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 3) If no interference is evident reanalyze affected sample(s) and narrate any outliers.
		QL	Low point on initial calibration curve.	QLs established shall not exceed those required by project; Refer to accompanying table.	QLs that exceed established criteria shall be submitted to USACE for approval prior to any project samples analyses

All corrective actions associated with USACE project work shall be documented and the records maintained by the laboratory.

Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, SW-846, USEPA, December 1998.

CV = Continuing Calibration Verification

QL = Quantitation Limit

RF = Response Factor

MS = Matrix Spike

MSD = Matrix Spike Duplicate

ICV = Initial Calibration Verification

GC = Gas Chromatograph

MDL = Method Detection Limit

RSD = Relative Standard Deviation

DL = Detection Limit

LCS = Laboratory Control Sample

RPD = Relative Percent Difference

RT = Retention time

Table A-3**Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8015B (TPH)**

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW8015B	Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	Five-point calibration	Biannually or when daily calibration verification fails	RSD for average RF <20%	1) Identify and repeat analysis for outlying points 2) Recalculate using valid points
		CCV	Daily: before sample analysis, every 10 samples, and at the end of the analytical sequence	Response for all analytes within $\pm 15\%$ of expected value for primary and secondary column	1) Reanalyze CCV 2) If still out, identify and correct problem 3) Recalibrate and reanalyze all samples since last valid CCV
		Method Blank	1 per preparation batch	All analytes < $\frac{1}{2}$ QL	1) Investigate possible contamination source 2) Take appropriate corrective action 3) Repeat instrument blank analysis 4) Reextract and reanalyze all samples processed with a contaminated blank at no cost to USACE, unless analyte is not detected in associated samples or present at greater than 10x blank concentration. 5) Flag sample results associated with blank contamination
		LCS	1 LCS per preparation batch	Comparison recovery limits 65-135%	1) Reanalyze LCS. 2) If still out identify and correct problem. 3) Reextract and reanalyze affected samples.
		MS and MSD (level of spike must be less than the mid-level standard of the calibration curve)	1 MS/MSD per preparation batch	Comparison recovery limits 65-135% and RPD <35% for soil samples RPD >20 % for water samples	1) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 2) If no interference is evident re-extract and reanalyze MS/MSD once. 3) If still out report both sets of data.

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW8015B	Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	Surrogate spikes	Every sample, spike, standard, and method blank	Comparison recovery limits 65-135%	1) Recalculate result; if still out: 2) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 3) If no interference is evident reanalyze affected sample(s) and narrate any outliers.
		QL	Low point on initial calibration curve.	QLs established shall not exceed those required by project; Refer to accompanying table.	QLs that exceed established criteria shall be submitted to USACE for approval prior to any project samples analyses

All corrective actions associated with USACE project work shall be documented and the records maintained by the laboratory.

Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, SW-846, USEPA, December 1998.

CCV = Continuing Calibration Verification	ICV = Initial Calibration Verification	DL = Detection Limit
QL = Quantitation Limit	GC = Gas Chromatograph	LCS = Laboratory Control Sample
RF = Response Factor	MDL = Method Detection Limit	RPD = Relative Percent Difference
MS = Matrix Spike	RSD = Relative Standard Deviation	RT = Retention time
MSD = Matrix Spike Duplicate	TPH = Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	

Table A-4**Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8081A (Organochlorine Pesticides)**

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action^a
SW 8081A	Organochlorine Pesticides	ICAL five-point minimum	Initially and as required	$\% \text{ RSD} \leq 20\%$ or $r \geq 0.9995$	1) Check calculation 2) Recalibrate as necessary
		ICV	Daily, prior to sample analysis	$\pm 25\%$ difference from expected concentration.	1) Check calculation 2) Rerun ICV 3) Recalibrate as necessary
		CCV	After every 10 samples and end of sequence	$\pm 15\%$ difference from expected concentration.	1) Check calculation 2) Rerun ICV 3) Reanalyze samples subsequent to failed CCV 4) Recalibrate as necessary
		Method Blank	1 per preparation batch	All analytes $< \frac{1}{2}$ QL	1) Investigate possible contamination source 2) Take appropriate corrective action 3) Repeat instrument blank analysis 4) Reextract and reanalyze all samples processed with a contaminated blank at no cost to USACE, unless analyte is not detected in associated samples or present at greater than 10x blank concentration. 5) Flag sample results associated with blank contamination

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action ^a
SW 8081A	Organochlorine Pesticides and Chlorinated Herbicides	MS and MSD (level at the mid-level standard)	1 MS/MSD per preparation batch	Comparison Recovery Limits 60-140% RPD < 35 for soils; RPD < 20 for waters	1) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 2) If no interference is evident, reextract and reanalyze MS/MSD once. 3) If still out report both sets of data.
		LCS (prepared with second source standard)	LCS per preparation batch	Recovery within project limits see applicable Table	1) Check calculations 2) Reanalyze LCS, if passes, report. 3) If still out, reextract and reanalyze LCS and its associated samples.
		Surrogate Spike	Every sample, method blank, and standard.	See applicable Table	1) Check calculations. 2) Assess impact and narrate outlier. 3) Re-analyze once. 4) Reextract if both surrogates are outside of acceptance limits.
		Degradation Standards	Every 24 hours	Breakdown of Endrin < 25% or 4'-DDT < 20%	1) Evaluate system 2) Rerun Degradation 3) Perform system maintenance.
		QL	Low point on initial calibration curve.	QLs established shall not exceed those required by project; Refer to accompanying table.	QLs that exceed established criteria shall be submitted to USACE for approval prior to any project samples analyses

All corrective actions associated with USACE project work shall be documented and the records maintained by the laboratory.
Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, SW-846, USEPA, December 1998.

CCV	= Continuing Calibration Verification	ICV	= Initial Calibration Verification	DL	= Detection Limit
QL	= Quantitation Limit	GC	= Gas Chromatograph	LCS	= Laboratory Control Sample
RF	= Response Factor	MDL	= Method Detection Limit	RPD	= Relative Percent Difference
MS	= Matrix Spike	RSD	= Relative Standard Deviation	RT	= Retention time
MSD	= Matrix Spike Duplicate	TPH	= Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons		

Table A-5
Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8082 (PCBs)

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action ^a
SW8082	Polychlorinated Biphenyls	ICAL five-point minimum	Initially and as required	$\% \text{ RSD} \leq 20\%$ or $r \geq 0.9995$	1) Check calculation 2) Recalibrate as necessary
		ICV	Daily, prior to sample analysis	$\pm 25\%$ difference from expected concentration.	1) Check calculation 2) Rerun ICV 3) Recalibrate as necessary
		CCV	After every 10 samples and end of sequence	$\pm 15\%$ difference from expected concentration.	1) Check calculation 2) Rerun ICV 3) Reanalyze samples subsequent to failed CCV 4) Recalibrate as necessary
		MS and MSD (level at the mid-level standard of the calibration curve)	1 MS/MSD per preparation batch	Recovery and RPD within project limits	1) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 2) If no interference is evident reextract and reanalyze MS/MSD once. 3) If still out report both sets of data.
		Method Blank	1 per analytical batch, not to exceed 10 samples	All analytes $< \frac{1}{2}$ QL	1) Check calculation 2) Recalibrate as necessary 3) If sample results are ND, no action 4) Reextract and reanalyze all samples $< 10X$ the blank contamination 5) Report blank results down to the MDL

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action ^a
SW8082	PCBs	LCS (prepared with second source standard)	LCS per preparation batch	Recovery within project limits see applicable Table	1) Check calculations 2) Reanalyze LCS, if passes, report. 3) If still out, reextract and reanalyze LCS and its associated samples.
		Surrogate Spike	Every sample, method blank, and standard.	See applicable Table	1) Check calculations. 2) Assess impact and narrate outlier. 3 Re-analyze once. 4) Reextract if both surrogates are outside of limits. 5) Narrate any outliers.
		QL	Low point on initial calibration curve.	QLs established shall not exceed those required by project; Refer to accompanying table.	QLs that exceed established criteria shall be submitted to USACE for approval prior to any project samples analyses

All corrective actions associated with USACE project work shall be documented and the records maintained by the laboratory.

Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, SW-846, USEPA, December 1998.

CCV	= Continuing Calibration Verification	ICV	= Initial Calibration Verification	DL	= Detection Limit
QL	= Quantitation Limit	GC	= Gas Chromatograph	LCS	= Laboratory Control Sample
RF	= Response Factor	MDL	= Method Detection Limit	RPD	= Relative Percent Difference
MS	= Matrix Spike	RSD	= Relative Standard Deviation	RT	= Retention time
MSD	= Matrix Spike Duplicate	TPH	= Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons		

Table A-6
Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8270C

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW8270C	SVOCs	Instrument tune (DFTPP)	Once per 12-hour shift	Ion abundance criteria as described in SW8270	1) Reanalyze standard 2) Adjust MS tune until analysis of BFB passes specifications
		Degradation check using 4,4'-DDT, PCP and benzidine		Degradation of DDT to DDE and DDD $\leq 20\%$; PCP and benzidine should have normal area response and show no peak tailing	
		Five-point calibration (for all analytes)	Biannually or when daily calibration verification fails	RSD ≤ 15 (non-CCCs ≤ 30) $r \geq 0.995$ Avg RF > 0.30 (non-SPCCs > 0.05)	1) Identify and repeat analysis for outlying points 2) Recalculate using valid points
		CCV	Every 12 hrs, prior to sample analysis	Same RF criteria as for initial calibration Response for all analytes within $\pm 20\%$ of expected value	1) Reanalyze CCV 2) If still out, identify and correct problem 3) Recalibrate and reanalyze all samples since last valid CCV
		Internal Standard	Every sample, spike, standard and method blank	IS area count within 2x from daily CCV RT must have < 30 second change from daily CCV	1) Inspect mass spectroscopy or GC for malfunctions 2) Take appropriate corrective actions 2) Reanalyze affected samples

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW8270C	SVOCs	Method Blank	1 per preparation batch	All analytes < ½ QL	1) Investigate possible contamination source 2) Take appropriate corrective action 3) Repeat instrument blank analysis 4) Reextract and reanalyze all samples processed with a contaminated blank at no cost to USACE, unless analyte is not detected in associated samples or present at greater than 10x blank concentration. 5) Flag sample results associated with blank contamination
		LCS (prepared from second source standard)	1 LCS per preparation batch	Comparison recovery limits 60-120%	1) Reanalyze LCS. 2) If still out identify and correct problem. 3) Reextract and reanalyze affected samples.
		MS and MSD (level of spike must be less than the mid-level standard of the calibration curve) Surrogate spikes	1 MS/MSD per preparation batch	Comparison recovery limits 45-135% RPD < 50	1) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 2) If no interference is evident re-extract and reanalyze MS/MSD once. 3) If still out report both sets of data.
			Every sample, spike, standard, and method blank	Comparison recovery limits 60-120%	1) Recalculate result; if still out: 2) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 3) If no interference is evident reanalyze affected sample(s) and narrate any outliers.
		QL	Low point on initial calibration curve.	QLs established shall not exceed those required by project; Refer to accompanying table.	QLs that exceed established criteria shall be submitted to USACE for approval prior to any project samples analyses

All corrective actions associated with USACE project work shall be documented and the records maintained by the laboratory.

Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, SW-846, USEPA, December 1996.

CV= Continuing Calibration Verification	ICV = Initial Calibration Verification	DL = Detection Limit
GC= Gas Chromatograph	QL = Quantitation Limit	
LCS = Laboratory Control Sample	RF = Response Factor	
MDL = Method Detection Limit	RPD = Relative Percent Difference	MS = Matrix Spike
RSD = Relative Standard Deviation	RT = Retention time	MSD = Matrix Spike Duplicate

Table A-7
Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8290 (Dioxin/Furans)

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW8290	Dioxin/Furans	Instrument tune (PFK recommended)	Once per 12-hour shift	Ion abundance criteria as described in SW8290	1) Reanalyze standard 2) Adjust MS tune until analysis of PFK passes specifications
		Five-point calibration (for all analytes)	When daily calibration verification fails or when a new lot of standard solutions are used	RSD \leq 20 for unlabeled analytes RSD \leq 30 for labeled analytes S/N ratio \geq 10 Method ion abundance criteria met	1) Identify and repeat analysis for outlying points 2) Recalculate using valid points
		ICV	Every 12 hrs, prior to sample analysis and at the end of the 12-hour period	RF \pm 20% of initial calibration mean RF for unlabeled analytes; \pm 30% for labeled analytes End of 12-hour period is \pm 25% and \pm 35% Method ion abundance criteria met as for initial calibration	1) Reanalyze CCV 2) If still out, identify and correct problem 3) Recalibrate and reanalyze all samples since last valid CCV
		Internal Standard	Every sample, spike, standard and method blank	IS recovery 40-135%	1) Inspect mass spectrometer or GC for malfunctions 2) Take appropriate corrective actions 2) Reanalyze affected samples or flag data

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW8290	Dioxin/Furans	Method Blank (IS fortified blank)	1 per preparation batch	All analytes < ½ QL	1) Investigate possible contamination source 2) Take appropriate corrective action 3) Repeat instrument blank analysis 4) Reextract and reanalyze all samples processed with a contaminated blank at no cost to USACE, unless analyte is not detected in associated samples or present at greater than 10x blank concentration. 5) Flag sample results associated with blank contamination
		Duplicate Analysis	1 per preparation batch	≤ 25 RPD	1) Evaluate for method or instrument malfunction 2) reanalyze duplicate once. 3) If still out report both sets of data.
		MS and MSD	1 MS/MSD per preparation batch	Comparison recovery limits 45-135%RPD < 20	1) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 2) If no interference is evident re-extract and reanalyze MS/MSD once. 3) If still out report both sets of data.
		QL	Low point on initial calibration curve.	QLs established shall not exceed those required by project; Refer to accompanying table.	QLs that exceed established criteria shall be submitted to USACE for approval prior to any project samples analyses

All corrective actions associated with USACE project work shall be documented and the records maintained by the laboratory.

Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, SW-846, USEPA, December 1996.

ICV = Initial Calibration Verification

DL = Detection Limit

GC= Gas Chromatograph

QL = Quantitation Limit

RF = Response Factor

MS = Matrix Spike

MDL = Method Detection Limit

RPD = Relative Percent Difference

RSD = Relative Standard Deviation

MSD = Matrix Spike Duplicate

Table A-8**Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method 1668A (PCB Homologues)**

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
1668A	PCB Homologues	Instrument tune (PFK)	Once per 12-hour shift	Ion abundance criteria as described in Table 7 of Method 1668A	1) Reanalyze standard 2) Adjust MS tune until analysis of PFK passes specifications
		Five-point calibration (for all analytes)	When daily calibration verification fails	RSD < 20, if not, then $r > 0.995$ Ion abundance ratios met S/N ratio ≥ 10	1) Identify and repeat analysis for outlying points 2) Recalculate using valid points
		ICV	Every 12 hrs, prior to sample analysis	S/N ratio ≥ 10 Response for all analytes within method criteria of expected value RT criteria within method requirements	1) Reanalyze ICV 2) If still out, identify and correct problem 3) Recalibrate and reanalyze all samples since last valid ICV
		Internal Standard	Every sample, spike, standard and method blank	IS area count within 2x from daily CCV RT must have <30 second change from daily CCV 25-150% recovery	1) Inspect mass spectroscopy or GC for malfunctions 2) Take appropriate corrective actions 3) Reanalyze affected samples

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
1668A	PCB Homologues	Method Blank	1 per preparation batch	All analytes < ½ QL	1) Investigate possible contamination source 2) Take appropriate corrective action 3) Repeat instrument blank analysis 4) Reextract and reanalyze all samples processed with a contaminated blank at no cost to USACE, unless analyte is not detected in associated samples or present at greater than 10x blank concentration. 5) Flag sample results associated with blank contamination
		QC Check Sample (prepared from second source standard)	1 per initial calibration	Recovery limits meet method requirements	1) Reanalyze QC check standard. 2) If still out, recalibrate.
		Ongoing Precision and Recovery Standard (OPR)	1 per preparation batch	Recovery limits and RPDs meet method requirements	1) Evaluate for errors. 2) Re-extract and reanalyze, and cleanup OPR and associated data.
		QL	Low point on initial calibration curve.	QLs established shall not exceed those required by project; Refer to accompanying table.	QLs that exceed established criteria shall be submitted to USACE for approval prior to any project samples analyses

All corrective actions associated with USACE project work shall be documented and the records maintained by the laboratory.

ICV = Initial Calibration Verification

GC = Gas Chromatograph

QL = Quantitation Limit

QC= Quality Control

RF = Response Factor

RPD = Relative Percent Difference

MS = Matrix Spike

RSD = Relative Standard Deviation

RT = Retention time

MSD = Matrix Spike Duplicate

Table A-9**Summary of Calibration and Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW8151A (Chlorinated Herbicides)**

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action^a
SW8151A	Chlorinated Herbicides	ICAL five-point minimum	Initially and as required	$\% \text{ RSD} \leq 20\%$ or $r \geq 0.9995$	1) Check calculation 2) Recalibrate as necessary
		ICV	Daily, prior to sample analysis	$\pm 25\%$ difference from expected concentration.	1) Check calculation 2) Rerun ICV 3) Recalibrate as necessary
		CCV	After every 10 samples and end of sequence	$\pm 15\%$ difference from expected concentration.	1) Check calculation 2) Rerun ICV 3) Reanalyze samples subsequent to failed CCV 4) Recalibrate as necessary
		Method Blank	1 per preparation batch	All analytes $< \frac{1}{2}$ QL	1) Investigate possible contamination source 2) Take appropriate corrective action 3) Repeat instrument blank analysis 4) Reextract and reanalyze all samples processed with a contaminated blank at no cost to USACE, unless analyte is not detected in associated samples or present at greater than 10x blank concentration. 5) Flag sample results associated with blank contamination

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action ^a
SW 8151A	Chlorinated Herbicides	MS and MSD (level at the mid-level standard)	1 MS/MSD per preparation batch	Comparison Recovery Limits 85-115% RPD < 35 for soils; RPD < 20 for waters	1) Evaluate for supportable matrix effect. 2) If no interference is evident, reextract and reanalyze MS/MSD once. 3) If still out report both sets of data.
		LCS (prepared with second source standard)	LCS per preparation batch	Recovery within project limits see applicable Table	1) Check calculations 2) Reanalyze LCS, if passes, report. 3) If still out, reextract and reanalyze LCS and its associated samples.
		Surrogate Spike	Every sample, method blank, and standard.	See applicable Table	1) Check calculations. 2) Assess impact and narrate outlier. 3) Re-analyze once. 4) Reextract if both surrogates are outside of acceptance limits.
		QL	Low point on initial calibration curve.	QLs established shall not exceed those required by project; Refer to accompanying table.	QLs that exceed established criteria shall be submitted to USACE for approval prior to any project samples analyses

All corrective actions associated with USACE project work shall be documented and the records maintained by the laboratory.
Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, SW-846, USEPA, December 1998.

CCV	= Continuing Calibration Verification	ICV	= Initial Calibration Verification	DL	= Detection Limit
QL	= Quantitation Limit	GC	= Gas Chromatograph	LCS	= Laboratory Control Sample
RF	= Response Factor	MDL	= Method Detection Limit	RPD	= Relative Percent Difference
MS	= Matrix Spike	RSD	= Relative Standard Deviation	RT	= Retention time
MSD	= Matrix Spike Duplicate	TPH	= Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons		

Table A-10**Summary of Internal Quality Control Procedures for Method SW4042 (Total DDT in Soil Test Kit)**

Analytical Method	Applicable Parameter	Quality Control Check	Minimum Frequency	Acceptance Criteria	Corrective Action
SW4042	Total DDTs	Two-point calibration standards at 0.2 and 1.0 mg/kg	Prepare and analyze during sample preparation and analysis for each batch	Response of the standards should be inversely relational to concentration	Reanalyze batch
		Method Blank	1 per batch	Response greater than the 0.1 mg/kg standard response	Investigate possible source of problem. Take appropriate corrective action. Reanalyze batch.
		Duplicate preparation and analysis	1 per batch	Equivalent result (< 0.2 mg/kg; >0.2 <1 mg/kg; or >1 mg/kg)	Identify potential source of problem and correct. If source is not apparent, reanalyze same sample and duplicate in following batch to verify heterogeneity.

ATTACHMENT B

Table B-1
Quantitation Limits and Screening Guidance for
Metals by Method SW6010B [or SW6020]
Mercury by Method SW7471A

Parameter	Analyte	Soil MDL ¹ (mg/kg)	Soil QL (mg/kg)	Action Goals (mg/kg)
SW6010B	Arsenic	0.26	5	23
	Barium	0.034	100	188
	Beryllium	0.014	0.5	1.68
	Boron	0.79	20	71.6
	Cadmium	0.028	0.5	1.8
	Chromium	0.097	10	149
	Copper	0.095	10	88.7
	Cobalt	0.043	10	26.7
	Lead	0.16	20	46.7
	Manganese	0.042	100	1260
	Nickel	0.13	10	132
	Silver	0.02	0.5	1
	Vanadium	0.033	10	136
	Zinc	0.55	10	169
SW7471A	Mercury	0.017	0.1	0.58

¹ Report the test result to MDL and “J” flag the result below the QL. These detection limits were calculated using a clean matrix and may not be achievable with the samples collected for this project. By reporting down to the detection limit, there is an increased probability of low-level false positives.

² Action Goals – Coastal Salt Marsh Sites, ROD/RAP

Notes: Both MDLs and QLs for soil in the tables are undiluted. Actual reported concentrations will be adjusted for dry weight and any dilution.

MDL = Method Detection Limit

mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram

NE = not established

QL = Quantitation Limit

Table B-2
Quantitation Limits and Screening Guidance for
Extractable Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons by Method SW8015B

Parameter	Analytical Method	Analyte	Method Detection Limits¹ (MDL) (mg/kg)	Soil QL (mg/kg)	Action Goals² (mg/kg)
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons – Extractable	SW8015B	Diesel (C12–C24) Motor Oil (C24–C36)	0.784	100	144

¹ Report the test result to MDL and “J” flag the result below the QL. These detection limits were calculated using a clean matrix and may not be achievable with the samples collected for this project. By reporting down to the detection limit, there is an increased probability of low-level false positives.

² Action Goals – Coastal Salt Marsh Sites, ROD/RAP

Note: Both MDLs and QLs for soil in the tables are undiluted. Actual reported concentrations will be adjusted for dry weight and dilution.

MDL = Method Detection Limit

mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram

QL = Quantitation Limit

Table B-3
Quantitation Limits and Screening Guidance for
Organochlorine Pesticides by Method SW8081A

Parameter	Analyte	Soil		Action Goals ² (µg/kg)
		MDL ¹ (µg/kg)	QL (µg/kg)	
Organochlorine Pesticides SW8081A	Alpha-Chlordane	NE	2	4.79 (total Chlordanes)
	Gamma-Chlordane	NE	2	4.79 (total Chlordanes)
	4,4'-DDD	NE	4.5	24 (total DDTs)
	4,4'-DDE	NE	4.5	24 (total DDTs)
	4,4'-DDT	NE	4.5	24 (total DDTs)
	Endrin aldehyde	NE	4	6.4
	Heptachlor	NE	2	8.8
	Heptachlor Epoxide	NE	2	8.8
	Surrogates:			
	Decachlorobiphenyl	NA	NA	NA
	Tetrachloro-m-xylene	NA	NA	NA

¹ Report the test result to MDL and “J” flag the result below the QL. These detection limits were calculated using a clean matrix and may not be achievable with the samples collected for this project. By reporting down to the detection limit, there is an increased probability of low-level false positives.

² Action Goals – Coastal Salt Marsh Sites, ROD/RAP

Notes: Both MDLs and QLs for soil in the tables are undiluted. Actual reported concentrations will be adjusted for dry weight and dilution.

MDL = method detection limit

QL = quantitation limit

NE = Not Established

µg/kg = micrograms per kilogram

Total DDT = summation of DDD, DDE and DDT result values. Non-detects will not be calculated in the summation.

Table B-4
Quantitation Limits and Screening Guidance for
Polychlorinated Biphenyls by Method SW8082

Parameter	Analyte	Soil		Action Goals (µg/kg)
		MDL ¹ (µg/kg)	QL (µg/kg)	
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) SW8082	Aroclor-1016	NE	20	NE
	Aroclor-1221	NE	20	NE
	Aroclor-1232	NE	20	NE
	Aroclor-1242	NE	20	NE
	Aroclor-1248	NE	20	NE
	Aroclor-1254	NE	20	NE
	Aroclor-1260	NE	20	NE
	Total PCBs*	NE	20	90
	Surrogates:			
	Decabchlorobiphenyl	NA	NA	NA
	Tetrachloro-m-xylene	NA	NA	NA

¹ Report the test result to MDL and “J” flag the result below the QL. These detection limits were calculated using a clean matrix and may not be achievable with the samples collected for this project. By reporting down to the detection limit, there is an increased probability of low-level false positives.

² Action Goals – Coastal Salt Marsh Sites, ROD/RAP

Notes: Both MDLs and QLs for soil in the tables are undiluted. Actual reported concentrations will be adjusted for dry weight and dilution.

* Total PCBs is a summation of the detected Aroclors.

MDL = Method Detection Limit

mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram

QL = Quantitation Limit

Total PCBs* = summation of aroclors result values. Non-detects will not be calculated in the summation.

Table B-5
Quantitation Limits and Screening Guidelines for
Phenol and Pentachlorophenol by Method SW8270C

Parameter	Analyte	Soil MDL¹ (µg/kg)	Soil QL (µg/kg)	Action Goals² (µg/kg)
SW8270C	Pentachlorophenol	NE	10	17
	Phenol	NE	30	130
	Surrogate p-Terphenyl	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹ Report the test result to MDL and “J” flag the result below the QL. These detection limits were calculated using a clean matrix and may not be achievable with the samples collected for this project. By reporting down to the detection limit, there is an increased probability of low-level false positives.

² Action Goals – Coastal Salt Marsh Sites, ROD/RAP

Note: Both MDLs and QLs for soil in the tables are undiluted. Actual reported concentrations will be adjusted for dry weight and dilution.

QL = Quantitation Limit MDL = Method Detection Limit NE = not established

Table B-6
Quantitation Limits and Screening Guidance for
Dioxin Congeners by Method SW8290

Compound	QL (ng/kg)	Equivalency Factor	Action Goal¹ (ng/kg)
2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD)	NE	1	21
1,2,3,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (PeCDD)	NE	0.5	NE
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (HxCDD)	NE	0.1	NE
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (HxCDD)	NE	0.1	NE
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (HxCDD)	NE	0.1	NE
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (HpCDD)	NE	0.01	NE
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-Octachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (OCDD)	NE	0.001	NE
2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzofuran (TCDF)	NE	0.1	NE
1,2,3,7,8-Pentadibenzofuran (PCDF)	NE	0.05	NE
2,3,4,7,8-Pentadibenzofuran (PCDF)	NE	0.5	NE
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexadibenzofuran (HxCDF)	NE	0.1	NE
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexadibenzofuran (HxCDF)	NE	0.1	NE
2,3,4,6,7,8-Hexadibenzofuran (HxCDF)	NE	0.1	NE
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexadibenzofuran (HxCDF)	NE	0.1	NE
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptadibenzofuran (HpCDF)	NE	0.01	NE
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-Heptadibenzofuran (HpCDF)	NE	0.01	NE
Octachlorodibenzofuran (OCDF)	NE	0.001	NE

¹ Action Goals – Coastal Salt Marsh Sites, ROD/RAP

ng/kg = nanograms per kilogram

QL = Quantitation Limit

TEQ = 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalency

NE = not established

Table B-7
Quantitation Limits and Screening Guidance for
Polychlorinated Biphenyl Homologues by Method 1668A

Parameter	Analyte	Soil		Action Goals ² (µg/kg)
		MDL ¹ (µg/kg)	Maximum QL (µg/kg)	
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) 1668A	Monochlorobiphenyls	NE	50	NE
	Dichlorobiphenyls	NE	50	NE
	Trichlorobiphenyls	NE	50	NE
	Tetrachlorobiphenyls	NE	50	NE
	Pentachlorobiphenyls	NE	50	NE
	Hexachlorobiphenyls	NE	50	NE
	Heptachlorobiphenyls	NE	50	NE
	Octachlorobiphenyls	NE	50	NE
	Nonachlorobiphenyls	NE	50	NE
	Decachlorobiphenyl	NE	50	NE
	Total PCBs*	NE	50	90

¹ Report the test result to MDL and “J” flag the result below the QL. These detection limits were calculated using a clean matrix and may not be achievable with the samples collected for this project. By reporting down to the detection limit, there is an increased probability of low-level false positives.

² Action Goals – Coastal Salt Marsh Sites, ROD/RAP

Notes: Both MDLs and QLs for soil in the tables are undiluted. Actual reported concentrations will be adjusted for dry weight and dilution.

* Total PCBs is a summation of the detected concentrations of homologues. Non-detects will not be calculated in the summation.

MDL = Method Detection Limit

QL = Quantitation Limit

Table B-8
Quantitation Limits and Screening Guidelines for
Dichlorprop by Method SW8151A

Parameter	Analyte	Soil MDL¹ (µg/kg)	Soil QL (µg/kg)	Action Goals² (µg/kg)
SW8151A	Dichlorprop	NE	5.0	140
	Surrogate 2,4-Dichlorophenylacetic acid	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹ Report the test result to MDL and “J” flag the result below the QL. These detection limits were calculated using a clean matrix and may not be achievable with the samples collected for this project. By reporting down to the detection limit, there is an increased probability of low-level false positives.

² Action Goals – Coastal Salt Marsh Sites, ROD/RAP

Note: Both MDLs and QLs for soil in the tables are undiluted. Actual reported concentrations will be adjusted for dry weight and dilution.

NE = Not Established

ATTACHMENT C

Table C-1
Data Qualifier Convention for Inorganic Analyses

Quality Control Item	Evaluation	Data Qualifier Flag			Sample(s) Qualified
		Detects		Non-detects	
		Non Biased	Biased		
HOLDING TIMES	1) Holding time exceeded by 2 times or less 2) Holding time exceeded by greater than 2 times	J	J- J-	UJ R	Sample
INITIAL CALIBRATION	1) $r < 0.995$	J	J	UJ	All samples in same instrument batch
INITIAL CALIBRATION VERIFICATION (ICV)	1) % Recovery $> 110\%$ but $\leq 125\%$ (Hg, % Recovery $> 120\%$ but $\leq 135\%$) 2) % Recovery $> 125\%$ (Hg, % Recovery $> 135\%$) 3) % Recovery $< 90\%$ but $\geq 75\%$ (Hg, % Recovery $< 80\%$ but $\geq 65\%$) 4) % Recovery $< 75\%$ (Hg, % Recovery $< 65\%$)	J R J J	J+ R J- J-	No qual. No qual. UJ R	All samples bracketed by ICV
CONTINUING CALIBRATION VERIFICATION (CCV)	1) % Recovery $> 110\%$ but $\leq 125\%$ (Hg, % Recovery $> 120\%$ but $\leq 135\%$) 2) % Recovery $> 125\%$ (Hg, % Recovery $> 135\%$) 3) % Recovery $< 90\%$ but $\geq 75\%$ (Hg, % Recovery $< 80\%$ but $\geq 65\%$) 4) % Recovery $< 75\%$ (Hg, % Recovery $< 65\%$)	J R J J	J+ R J- J-	No qual. No qual. UJ R	All samples bracketed by CCV
METHOD BLANK CONTAMINATION	Sample results less than or equal to 5 times the blank contamination	U	U	No qual.	All samples in the same Analytical (Preparation) Batch

MATRIX SPIKE RECOVERY	1) % Recovery < CL but $\geq 30\%$	J	J-	UJ	All samples from same site and similar matrix interference
	2) % Recovery < 30%	J	J-	R	
	3) % Recovery > CL	J	J+	No qual.	
	4) RPD > CL			UJ	
LABORATORY CONTROL SAMPLE RECOVERY	1) % Recovery < CL but $\geq 50\%$	J	J-	UJ	All samples in the same Analytical (Preparation) Batch
	2) % Recovery < 50%	J	J	R	
	3) % Recovery > CL	J	J+	No qual.	
	4) RPD > CL	J	J	UJ	
REPORTING LIMITS	Reporting limits not matching the project specified limits	No qual.	No qual.	No qual.	Sample (noted in outlier report) Sample
	Reported result less than the project reporting detection limit.	J	J	No qual.	
FIELD DUPLICATES	RPD > CL	No qual.	No qual.	No qual.	Non-compliant results
FIELD BLANKS EQUIPMENT BLANKS	Sample results within 5 times blank contamination	U	U	No qual.	All samples in the same sampling event

Alternate qualifiers are acceptable on a case-by-case basis based upon validator's professional judgment. All deviations from the above qualification scheme shall be documented.

Table C-2
Data Qualifier Convention for GC Analyses

Quality Control Item	Evaluation	Data Qualifier Flag			Sample(s) Qualified
		Detects		Nondetects	
		Non Biased	Biased		
HOLDING TIMES (Extraction/Analysis)	1) Holding time exceeded by 2 times or less 2) Holding time exceeded by greater than 2 times	J J	J- J-	UJ R	Sample
COOLER TEMPERATURE	1) > 6 and ≤10 degrees Centigrade 2) >10 degrees Centigrade 3) < 2 degrees Centigrade	J J No qual.	J- J- No qual.	UJ R No qual.	All samples shipped in the affected cooler. (Shipping Batch)
INITIAL CALIBRATION	1) %RSD > 20% 2) r < 0.995	J J	J J	UJ UJ	All samples in the same instrument batch
INITIAL CALIBRATION VERIFICATION (ICV)	1) % Difference > +25% 2) % Difference < -25% and ≥ -50% 3) % Difference < -50%	J J J	J+ J- J-	No qual. UJ R	All samples bracketed by the ICV
CONTINUING CALIBRATION (CCV)	1) % Difference > +15% 2) % Difference < -15% and ≥ -50% 3)% Difference < -50%	J J J	J+ J- J-	No qual. UJ R	All samples bracketed by the CCV
METHOD BLANK CONTAMINATION	1) Common lab contaminant results less than or equal to 10 times the blank contamination 2) Other compound results less than or equal to 5 times the blank contamination	U U	U U	No qual. No qual.	All samples in the same Analytical (Preparation) Batch
SURROGATE RECOVERY	1) % Recovery < CL but ≥ 10% 2) % Recovery <10% 3) % Recovery > CL	J J J	J- J- J+	UJ R No qual.	Sample

Quality Control Item	Evaluation	Data Qualifier Flag			Sample(s) Qualified
		Detects		Nondetects	
		Non Biased	Biased		
MATRIX SPIKE RECOVERY	1) % Recovery < CL but ≥ 10%	J	J-	UJ	Parent Sample
	2) % Recovery <10%	J	J-	R	
	3) % Recovery > CL	J	J+	No qual.	
	4) RPD > CL	J	J	UJ	
LABORATORY CONTROL SAMPLE RECOVERY	1) % Recovery < CL but ≥ 10%	J	J-	UJ	All samples in the same Analytical (Preparation) Batch
	2) % Recovery <10%	J	J-	R	
	3) % Recovery > CL	J	J+	No qual.	
	4) RPD > CL	J	J	UJ	
REPORTING LIMITS	Reporting limits not matching the project specified limits.	No qual.	No qual.	No qual.	Sample (noted in outlier report) Sample
	Results reported below the project reporting detection limit.	J	J	No qual.	
FIELD DUPLICATES	1) RPD > CL	No qual.	No qual.	no qual.	Non-compliant results
FIELD BLANKS EQUIPMENT BLANKS	1) Common lab contaminant results within 10 times blank contamination	U	U	No qual.	All samples in the same sampling event
	2) Other lab contaminant results within 5 times blank contamination	U	U	No qual.	
TRIP BLANKS	1) Common lab contaminant results within 10 times blank contamination	U	U	No qual.	All samples in the same Shipping Batch
	2) Other lab contaminant results within 5 times blank contamination	U	U	No qual.	

Alternate qualifiers are acceptable on a case-by-case basis based upon validator professional judgment. All deviations from the above qualification scheme shall be documented.

Table C-3
Data Qualifier Convention for GC/MS Analyses

Quality Control Item	Evaluation	Data Qualifier Flag			Sample(s) Qualified
		Detects		Nondetects	
		Non Biased	Biased		
HOLDING TIMES (Extraction/Analysis)	1) Holding time exceeded by 2 times or less	J	J-	UJ	Sample
	2) Holding time exceeded by greater than 2 times	J	J-	R	
COOLER TEMPERATURE	1) > 6 and ≤10 degrees Centigrade	J	J-	UJ	All samples shipped in the affected cooler (Shipping Batch)
	2) >10 degrees Centigrade	J	J-	R	
	3) < 2 degrees Centigrade	No qual.	No qual.	No qual.	
INSTRUMENT TUNING	1) Ion abundance criteria not met	JN	JN	R	All samples associated to an initial calibration, if tune is associated to an initial calibration. All samples in same instrument batch, if tune is associated with a calibration verification.
INITIAL CALIBRATION	1) Average RRF < 0.05	J	J	R	All samples associated with the initial calibration
	2) %RSD > 30%	J	J	UJ	
	3) r < 0.995	J	J	UJ	
INITIAL CALIBRATION VERIFICATION (ICV)	1) Average RRF < 0.05	J	J	R	All samples associated to the ICV
	2) % Difference > +25%	J	J+	no qual.	
	3) % Difference < -25% and ≥ -50%	J	J-	UJ	
	4) % Difference < -50%	J	J-	R	

Quality Control Item	Evaluation	Data Qualifier Flag			Sample(s) Qualified
		Detects		Nondetects	
		Non Biased	Biased		
CONTINUING CALIBRATION VERIFICATION (CCV)	1) Average RRF < 0.05 2) % Difference > +25% 3) % Difference < -25% and ≥ -50% 4) % Difference < -50%	J J J J	J J+ J- J-	R no qual. UJ R	All samples in the instrument batch
METHOD BLANK CONTAMINATION	1) Common lab contaminant and tentatively identified compound (TIC) results less than or equal to 10 times blank contamination 2) Other compound results less than or equal to 5 times blank contamination	U U	U U	No qual. No qual.	All samples in the same analytical batch (preparation batch)
SURROGATE RECOVERY	1) % Recovery < CL but ≥ 10% 2) % Recovery <10% 3) % Recovery > CL Note: For semivolatile analysis, two or more surrogates in a fraction must be out of criteria for qualification unless recovery < 10%.	J J J	J- J- J+	UJ R no qual.	Sample
MATRIX SPIKE RECOVERY	1) % Recovery < CL but ≥ 10% 2) % Recovery <10% 3) % Recovery > CL 4) RPD > CL	J J J J	J- J- J+ J	UJ R no qual. UJ	Parent Sample
LABORATORY CONTROL SAMPLE RECOVERY	1) % Recovery < CL but ≥ 10% 2) % Recovery <10% 3) % Recovery > CL 4) RPD > CL	J J J J	J- J- J+ J	UJ R no qual. UJ	All samples in the same analytical batch (preparation batch)

Quality Control Item	Evaluation	Data Qualifier Flag			Sample(s) Qualified
		Detects		Nondetects	
		Non Biased	Biased		
REPORTING LIMITS	1) Reporting limits not matching the project specified limits 2) Results reported below the project reporting detection limit.	No qual. J	No qual. J	No qual. No qual.	Sample
FIELD DUPLICATES	1) RPD > CL	No qual.	No qual.	no qual.	Non-compliant results
FIELD BLANKS EQUIPMENT BLANKS	1) Common lab contaminants and tentatively identified compound (TIC) results within 10 times blank contamination	U	U	No qual.	All samples in the same sampling event
	2) Other lab contaminant results within 5 times blank contamination	U	U	No qual.	

Alternate qualifiers are acceptable on a case-by-case basis based upon validator professional judgment. All deviations from the above qualification scheme shall be documented.